

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William Baxter Lee, of Tennessee, to be United States district judge for the eastern and middle districts of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Gaston Louis Porterie, to be United States District Judge for the western district of Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas D. Samford to be United States attorney, middle district of Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Chester S. Dishong to be United States marshal, southern district of Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of William H. McDonnell to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, the nomination provides for the reappointment of one who has already rendered splendid service. I therefore move the confirmation of his nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Lonnie B. Ormes to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Howard Norman Old, to be senior sanitary engineer, United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Frank Russell Shaw to be senior sanitary engineer, United States Public Health Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 1, 1939

Lt. (J. G.) Quentin M. Greeley to be a lieutenant in the Coast Guard of the United States, to rank as such from July 1, 1937. (Lieutenant Greeley is now serving under temporary commission issued during the recess of the Senate.)

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 1, 1939

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Otto Kerner to be a judge of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

William Baxter Lee to be United States district judge for the eastern and middle districts of Tennessee.

Gaston Louis Porterie to be United States district judge for the western district of Louisiana.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Thomas D. Samford to be United States attorney for the middle district of Alabama.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Chester S. Dishong to be United States marshal for the southern district of Florida.

William H. McDonnell to be United States marshal for the northern district of Illinois.

Lonnie B. Ormes to be United States marshal for the middle district of Tennessee.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Howard Norman Old to be senior sanitary engineer.

Frank Russell Shaw to be senior sanitary engineer.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou Ancient of Days, when the earth felt its first throb of life, it was touched to form by Thine infinite spirit. Thou didst gather it up and shape it into unjarring harmonies. O help us to live in the revealing glory of the Light of the World. O bread of life, come to the souls of men, lift us high to the still place where we may know of Thine unsearchable riches. Enable us to think true thoughts and speak true words. A pure thought breathed into the blossom of a pure word is an inspiration to good and upright living. Almighty God, allow not the air of uncertainty to tremble before our gaze. May we discern clarity, intention, and purpose in the trend of things. O make bare Thine arms. Fold them about our President, our Speaker, and the Congress; and may they declare that greatness which makes men great. In the name of our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and to include therein a speech made by Secretary of the Interior Ickes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the Record.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, from the Committee on Appropriations, filed a conference report and statement on House Joint Resolution 83, making appropriation for work relief and relief for printing under the rule.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.

IDAHO HIGHWAY TO YELLOWSTONE PARK

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the grandeur of the western mountains and the scenic beauty of the national

parks attract thousands of visitors and tourists to our Western States annually. Particular interest is manifested in the Yellowstone National Park, and many travelers journeying to the southwest and desirous of seeing America first include the Yellowstone Park in their itinerary. After touring the park many seek a direct route from the Yellowstone to Salt Lake and the southwest through the beautiful valleys and wonderful mountain ranges of southeastern Idaho only to meet with disappointment when they find that there is no gateway from the Yellowstone into the adjoining State of Idaho.

Mr. Speaker, the State of Idaho to provide accommodations for this travel, has in good faith and in accord with an understanding reached with the National Park Service, constructed a link in the State highway system through the Bechler Basin to the park boundary at Cave Falls, to connect with a short link in the park highway system to be constructed by the Park Service between Cave Falls and the Old Faithful Inn which will provide a direct route through the wonderful Saw Tooth Mountain ranges in Idaho to Salt Lake and California.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of convenience to the vacationists and travelers to the southwest passing through the Yellowstone Park and to encourage visitors to our national parks and trips through the matchless mountain sections of Idaho, the people of our State in support of a plan to establish a gateway between the national park and the construction of a link to connect the Yellowstone loop highway with the Idaho State highway system, have joined, speaking through the house and senate of the Idaho State Legislature in a joint memorial to Congress to "urge the passage of such legislation and that Congress make the necessary appropriations to provide for and to carry to completion the construction of the road" mentioned within the boundaries of the Yellowstone Park.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the memorial herewith presented by the State Legislature of Idaho may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

House Joint Memorial 1

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that

Whereas the Yellowstone National Park is bounded by three intermountain States, namely, Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming, with three entrances from Montana, two from Wyoming, and none from Idaho; by reason of the reputation and popularity of the said Yellowstone National Park as a national playground, thousands of people from the Nation and the world visit said park each year, and as a result thereof great publicity of a beneficial nature and of great value accrues to these two States, namely, Montana and Wyoming, and the gateway communities of said States; that

Whereas due to said travel the greatly increasing traffic in said national park is producing and will continue to produce, unless relieved, great traffic congestion at said entrances and in the so-called Bottle Neck at Old Faithful in said park; and

Whereas there now exists a State highway in the State of Idaho for an Idaho entrance via the Bechler Ranger Station and Bechler River to the Yellowstone National Park line which would require an additional construction of highway by the Government of approximately 22 miles to extend such highway to the Yellowstone Loop Highway at Old Faithful and produce an Idaho entrance which would relieve said point and its traffic congestion and open up a highly scenic area within the said Yellowstone National Park not now accessible to the motorist, and would provide great additional benefits to the State of Idaho and to communities along said entrance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Idaho (the senate concurring), That we most respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States that the said Congress favorably consider such legislation and passage and make such necessary appropriations to provide for and carry to completion the highway above mentioned from the Yellowstone Park line to the Loop Highway of said Yellowstone National Park at Old Faithful, and that the National Park Service of the Department of Interior of the United States be authorized to begin immediately on the construction of said highway; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be authorized, and he is hereby directed, to immediately forward certified copies of this joint memorial to the Secretary of the Interior,

to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute in order that I may ask the gentleman from Virginia a question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman from Virginia inform the House when it is purposed to bring up for consideration the conference report on the relief bill?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is the purpose to call it up the first thing tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a copy of a letter I wrote to Mr. Donald Wakefield Smith, member of the National Labor Relations Board, and his reply to my letter, notwithstanding the estimate of the Public Printer that it will make three pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at an estimated cost of \$135.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the need for a permanent Public Works Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRANT of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address on the life and character of Robert Edward Lee delivered by Mrs. L. M. Bashinsky, past president general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy at the State Teachers College in Troy, Ala., January 19, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the American Teacher.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received in opposition to Senate Resolution No. 24, introduced by Senator NYE.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week in consideration of House Resolution 67.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are the minority members agreeable to this request?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Yes; I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I am sure they are.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And the request is for this week only?

Mr. SATTERFIELD. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address of the Honorable Albert W. Hawks to the Congress of American Industry.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HARTLEY]?

There was no objection.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 76

Resolved, That JOHN C. KUNKEL, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected to the Committee on the Civil Service of the House of Representatives.

The resolution was agreed to.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of this Congress to the fact that yesterday, January 31, 1939, the Netherlands Trade Agreement with the United States expired.

I wish also to suggest to the proper committee of the House that they immediately take steps to investigate this agreement with the idea of canceling same or of so reducing its effect by tariff imposition as to prevent the further dumping here of sago and tapioca starch, which, in 1937, amounted to the enormous sum of 466,327,683 pounds, or nearly 40 percent of this country's total starch consumption.

This means direct and destructive competition with Maine, New York, Minnesota, Montana, and Idaho potatoes; competition with Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota corn; with our wheat; and our Southland's rice; and a continual reduction or depression of farm prices in general because we cannot hope to compete with this duty-free, cheap, tropical-labor production and retain our high standard of living or civilization.

No doubt you appreciate the fact that a fair proportion of several important agricultural crops are converted into starch, either for sale as such or as derivatives of starch, such as sirup and sugars. In the case of corn about one-third of all the corn grain shipped to the primary markets is converted into cornstarch, or into one of a multitude of its derivatives. In short crop years the proportion is even greater. The corn-refining industry consists of 14 plants, which have processed in recent years from 58,000,000 bushels in 1935 to 87,000,000 bushels—in 1926 and also 1929—of shelled corn annually. Over 68,000,00 bushels were processed in 1937. The corn-refining industry in recent years has paid the United States farmers more money annually than they have received from any one of 68 different crops, and there are only 78 important crops. This industry paid out more money for corn in either 1936 or 1937 than the farmers received from the sale of their corn grain in 46 out of the 48 States.

The United States potato-starch industry is large in Maine, where from 1,000,000 to 5,000,000 bushels of potatoes have been processed annually since 1927-28. Some potato starch is produced in Minnesota. About 15,000,000 pounds of wheat starch and approximately 1,000,000 pounds of rice starch are produced annually.

These industries are primarily American, using domestic labor, capital, and equipment. The corn-refining industry is a heavy-goods industry. The United States starch industries are liberal consumers of goods and services of other industries. Extensive use is made of paper and cotton bags. Chemicals and coal are an important item. The transportation of, first, the raw agricultural products to the plants and the accumulation of supplies, and then the shipment of the starches, their derivatives, and the byproducts to consuming centers are reasonably important sources of revenue to the railroads.

A severe competitive situation exists in the starch industry. Every starch-producing product, every kind of starch, and

every product competing with any starch is subject to a tariff, except tapioca and sago, two tropical starches which enter the United States free of duty. According to the Tariff Act of 1930, all starches are subject to an import duty. However, the Tariff Act of 1930 classifies tapioca and sago as "flour," although in various publications the Tariff Commission and the Department of Agriculture refer to them as starches. In addition they have been bound to the free list by the Netherlands Trade Agreement.

In binding tapioca and sago to the free list, through the medium of the Netherlands Trade Agreement, the Department of State caused United States agriculture, particularly the Potato, Rice, Wheat, and Corn Belt farmers, to lose an important outlet for cash crops. To date the only manner by which the Department of State will permit agriculture to meet the competition from the duty-free starches is on a price basis. To effectively compete with the imported starches, corn as a raw material for cornstarch production would have to decline below the current level of prices, which, from the Corn Belt farmers' standpoint, is generally considered unsatisfactory to the maintenance of a reasonable income and standard of living.

The current drop in the imports of tapioca and sago does not mean that the American starch interests will no longer be affected by the imports of the duty-free starches. From 1900 to date the imports have increased at an average rate of 6 percent per year, or have increased 100 percent every 12 years. The rate of increase is materially greater than that of those industries which require starch as a raw material. Obviously, the United States starch market is being taken over by foreign interests. It means a decreasing market exists for those United States farm products which may be used for starch production.

Why do these imports exist? There are many reasons. The most important one is that tapioca and sago are free of any import duty; in addition, they are bound to the free list by the Netherlands Trade Agreement. The cost of producing tapioca or sago is much less than that of corn or cornstarch. The tropical starches far outyield corn in the amount of starch produced per acre of raw material; their labor is exceedingly cheap—25 cents per day; capital equipment is crude and limited, and the hot tropical sun is extensively substituted for coal. These tropical starches are, therefore, in a better competitive position than cornstarch. The corn-loan plan of the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938, and the Government's efforts to raise prices, and its sympathy toward higher prices of other items which form a large proportion of the total cost of starch have limited the domestic starch manufacturers' efforts to effectively compete with the imported starches on a price basis but with what a cost in the taxpayers' hard-earned money!

Attached are a number of tables and charts. There is a tabulation and a chart of the imports over a period of years. The proportion of the domestic starch market taken over by tapioca and sago is depicted in a table and chart. There is also an illustration of the relationship between the prices of cornstarch and tapioca and the duty-free imports. When tapioca is relatively expensive, the imports are small; when it is relatively cheap, as it has been for many years, the imports are large. The same price story applies in large part of potato starch.

THE PROBLEM OF CULL POTATOES IN MINNESOTA

A few years ago Minnesota supported a potato starch and flour industry. There were 17 plants for the manufacture of high-grade potato starch and flour that helped the farmers by returning to them some profit on the small or defective potatoes that were graded out to maintain the size and quality required for table stock. Only one plant, at Dalbo, is now in operation. Plants at Cambridge and Princeton are still usable but have not operated for several years. The plant at Dalbo still has unsold its last year's production of 100 tons of fine food quality starch. Close grading, if again established, will again yield a sufficient quantity of low-grade stock to reestablish this industry and give employment to Minnesota labor.

The potato-starch industry in Maine operated 23 plants with aid from the Government to farmers for diverting potatoes. Idaho operated 4 factories for their cull stock. Starch and potato flour were sold to the Surplus Commodities Corporation and given to the Relief Administration for distribution. One hundred and seventy-five thousand pounds were shipped into Minnesota to relief clients and the flour was well liked. It is used for gravies, fish balls, frying, potato bread, and it makes good mashed potato. This competed with the Minnesota plant at Dalbo, that received no governmental support.

The United States is the only country that produces starch that does not protect its producers by an import tax. In the Netherlands Trade Agreement which expired yesterday starch from the Netherlands Indies is allowed to enter the United States free of duty. The Netherlands homeland itself protects its own potato-starch industry by an import tax on sago and tapioca flour from its own colonies.

This agreement must not be renewed, and a protective import tax must be levied on starches, at least those of food grade, to protect our corn, rice, wheat, and potato industries.

Imports of tapioca and sago into the United States, fiscal years 1900-1918 and calendar years 1918-37

Year ended June 30:	Pounds
1900	16,846,056
1901	17,463,037
1902	27,608,739
1903	36,926,743
1904	42,485,474
1905	39,752,222
1906	44,015,071
1907	53,394,075
1908	61,086,838
1909	73,160,409
1910	49,144,386
1911	72,680,218
1912	61,335,612
1913	83,745,277
1914	81,275,445
1915	66,710,460
1916	75,838,057
1917	108,410,162
1918	114,531,221
Year ended Dec. 31:	
1918	80,564,156
1919	98,553,585
1920	104,098,137
1921	54,608,764
1922	95,075,153
1923	101,335,401
1924	89,197,614
1925	124,737,274
1926	109,459,129
1927	116,272,637
1928	176,541,580
1929	181,389,907
1930	114,049,999
1931	149,526,124
1932	139,476,830
1933	202,718,852
1934	188,870,639
1935	226,918,332
1936 ¹	305,938,103
1937 ²	466,327,683

¹ The Netherlands trade agreement became effective Feb. 1, 1936.

² Preliminary, subject to revision.

Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States, Department of Commerce.

Ratio of imports of tapioca and sago to total starch consumption, United States, 1920-37

Calendar year	Starch consumption ¹	Imports of tapioca and sago ²	Percent imports of tapioca and sago of domestic starch consumption
	Million lbs.	Million lbs.	Percent
1920	672.7	104.1	15.5
1921	649.7	54.6	8.4
1922	791.7	95.1	12.0
1923	714.7	101.3	14.2
1924	727.4	89.2	12.3

¹ Consists of domestic cornstarch sales compiled by the Corn Refiners' Statistical Bureau, and wheat-starch production, rice-starch production, and potato-starch production compiled from records of and reports to the Corn Industries Research Foundation; also of imports of starches, including all duty-free farinaceous substances (tapioca, sago, and arrowroot), compiled from official records of the Department of Commerce. Sweetpotato-starch production was included after 1934.

² Includes crude sago, sago flour, crude tapioca, tapioca flour, and prepared tapioca.

Ratio of imports of tapioca and sago to total starch consumption, United States, 1920-37—Continued

Calendar year	Starch consumption	Imports of tapioca and sago	Percent imports of tapioca and sago of domestic starch consumption
	Million lbs.	Million lbs.	Percent
1925	742.2	124.7	16.8
1926	733.6	106.5	14.8
1927	812.3	116.3	14.3
1928	836.2	176.5	21.1
1929	909.1	181.4	20.0
1930	717.4	114.1	15.9
1931	750.9	149.5	20.0
1932	666.3	139.5	21.0
1933	924.0	202.7	22.0
1934	835.6	188.9	22.7
1935	892.0	226.9	25.6
1936	1,153.8	305.9	26.6
1937 ³	1,199.0	466.3	38.9

³ Preliminary and subject to revision.

Important dislocations resulting from duty-free starch imports¹

Revenue to the farmer:

The 466,327,683 pounds of duty-free starches imported in 1937 are equivalent to the cornstarch produced from about 13,700,000 bushels of corn.* One bushel of corn yields approximately 34 pounds of cornstarch. Weighting the average monthly price of corn at Corn Belt farms by each month's corn grind, the weighted average price for 1937 was 93.5 cents per bushel. The value of 13,700,000 bushels at 93.5 cents per bushel is—

\$12,810,000

Revenue to the railroads:

a. Freight revenue on the corn-grain equivalent of the duty-free starch imports—

1,370,000

(The average freight from the farm to the processing plant is about 10 cents per bushel.)

b. Freight revenue on cornstarch—

700,000

(It is assumed that the freight revenue on cornstarch from the corn processing plants to the points of consumption would be at least 15 cents per 100 pounds greater than the revenue obtained from the transportation of the duty-free starches from the Atlantic coast ports to the points of consumption.)

c. Freight revenue on the byproducts obtained from the processing of the corn-grain equivalent of the duty-free starch imports—

330,000

(It is assumed that in the processing of a bushel of corn from 14 to 16 pounds of byproduct feeds are produced; also the average freight rate on the byproduct feeds from the point of production to that of consumption is \$3 to \$3.50 per ton.)

In addition, the processing of a bushel of corn yields about 1½ pounds of corn oil; the average freight on corn oil is estimated at one-half cent per pound—

100,000

d. Freight revenue to railroads on coal which would have been consumed to process corn-grain equivalent of the duty-free starch imports—

226,000

(The average freight per ton is about \$1.)

e. Freight revenue from other fuel, chemicals, bags and containers, supplies, etc., estimated at—

1,250,000

Revenue to labor:

a. Wages of men at corn plants to process the corn equivalent of the duty-free starch imports—

1,680,000

(About 7,000 men are employed at the corn-processing plants. The daily average capacity of the corn-processing plants is 365,320 bushels. Assuming the plants could operate at about 90 percent of their capacity, it would take a little more than 8 5-day weeks to process 13,700,000 bushels, the corn-grain equivalent of the imports. The average wage per week is \$30.)

b. Wages to bituminous-coal miners—

250,000

(It would take about 226,000 tons of bituminous coal to process 13,700,000 bushels of corn. The average output per man per day is 4.5 tons and the average wage is about \$5.)

c. Revenue to additional railroad labor—

(The freight revenue listed above would cover a large portion of dislocation in railroad labor. However, the processing of an additional 13,700,000 bushels would probably

¹ The figures apply similarly in varying degrees to potatoes, wheat, and rice starches.

Important dislocations resulting from duty-free starch imports—
Continued

require more locomotives, cars, other equipment, and crews. The amount involved is not known.)

Revenue to labor—Continued.

d. Revenue to farm labor—

(The price of corn under "revenue to the farmer" would include practically all of this item. It would not cover additional costs, if any, necessary to provide a larger supply of corn-grain, such as shelling charges, storage, etc.)

Miscellaneous:

Elevator charges	\$250,000
Fuel, excluding coal, chemicals, cotton bags and other containers, and miscellaneous supplies necessary to process the additional 13,700,000 bushels of corn (excluding freight costs included under "revenue to the railroads")	2,500,000

Total	21,466,000
-------	------------

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ROUTZOHN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address I delivered at the McKinley Day banquet, Dayton, Ohio, on Monday evening of this week, January 30.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROUTZOHN]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by the Honorable LYLE H. BOREN, a Member of this body, in Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

GRADING AND CLASSIFICATION OF CLERKS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE
(H. DOC. NO. 146)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 1, 1939.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 60 and ask its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

House Resolution 60

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Government Organization is authorized to continue its work begun under authority of House Resolution 60 of the Seventy-fifth Congress, as amended by House Resolution 106, Seventy-fifth Congress, and for such purposes said committee shall have the same power, authority, and jurisdiction as that conferred upon it by said House Resolution 60 and House Resolution 106 of the Seventy-fifth Congress: *Provided*, however, That any bills or resolutions reported by said committee shall have a privileged status and all points of order against said bills or resolutions shall be considered as waived.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out the last two words in line 9, all of line 10 and the word "waived" in line 11 and insert the following: "It shall be

in order to consider any such bills or resolutions so reported without the intervention of any point of order as provided in clause 4 of rule XXI."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SABATH. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] desire any time?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. SABATH. I yield the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution re-creates a committee that was created in the Seventy-fifth Congress. I feel that there is no opposition to the resolution. It gives the Speaker the privilege of reappointing this committee to continue its efforts on behalf of legislation having to do with the reorganization of the various bureaus and departments in order to bring about economy and efficiency in the Government. I am informed that one or two objections to the bill that came up for consideration during the last Congress have been eliminated and that the recommendations that this committee will make will meet with the general approval of the House.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH].

Mr. WADSWORTH. Are we to assume from the gentleman's observation that the committee, before its appointment, has agreed upon a measure to be reported to the House?

Mr. SABATH. I may say to the gentleman that I have been informed by the gentlemen who have been examining and investigating this problem that they feel they have perfected a bill by which they have succeeded in eliminating objectionable features that appeared in the bill reported during the last Congress.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Has the bill been introduced?

Mr. SABATH. I do not know whether the bill has been introduced or not, but these gentlemen have worked diligently upon a bill and upon the legislation. This bill, as I understand it, was not prepared or written by anyone but members of the House committee; so the objections that have heretofore been made that the legislation has been prepared somewhere else and just given to the Members of the House to introduce are not true.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Perhaps the gentleman is not authorized to make the statement, and if the question is unfair I shall not, of course, press it. Does the gentleman understand that the committee is to be appointed *de novo*?

Mr. SABATH. I am not in position to state, but I believe it would be a prudent thing to reappoint most of the members of this committee, who have given a great deal of thought and study to the problem. I presume the gentleman from New York, if he had the power to appoint a committee, would appoint efficient, experienced Members who have given a great deal of time and thought to the problem.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Does not the gentleman believe, if this committee is to be appointed, and I presume it would include most of the old membership, that the committee should commence *de novo* and allow hearings?

Mr. SABATH. I presume the committee will comply with any reasonable request. So far we have not heard any complaints against the committee refusing to hear any Members or anyone on the subject. That is my understanding.

Mr. WADSWORTH. There were no public hearings last year at all. The proceedings were held behind closed doors and not even the Membership of this House knew what was going on.

Mr. SABATH. Then I stand corrected if such is the case.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Before the bill was brought in I made a motion in the committee that hearings be held openly on

the bill and that it be considered before the committee. There were not even any hearings before the committee.

Mr. SABATH. I may say to the gentleman that I myself have always believed that committees should give a fair hearing to any Member or anyone else who has anything of value to present. However, I believe to hold hearings merely for the purpose of delaying important legislation is manifestly unfair.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The gentleman says they have already framed a bill which will be reported. Does the gentleman mean this committee is not going to study the problem at all?

Mr. SABATH. No, I did not say "framed." I did not use that word. I say they have been working on the question.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Who is "they"?

Mr. SABATH. The members of the former committee, in whom I know the gentleman from Massachusetts has implicit confidence.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Have the minority members of the committee been working with them?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. If I correctly understand the position of the gentleman, it is that he has confidence that in the event this resolution is adopted the Speaker in the selection of this committee will appoint men of discretion and good judgment, and that the committee will go about the study of the question in such a manner as the committee believes will elicit the necessary information and will report to the House a bill it believes expressive of the interests of the country and the will of the House.

The gentleman has referred to a committee. As I understand the position of the gentleman, it is that the gentleman has the impression that there are Members of the House who have been giving a great deal of study to this question and have formed pretty definite ideas as to what the bill should contain, and that the bill which will be reported, if a bill is reported covering such new proposal as may grow out of the study that has been conducted and, of course, the study that will be conducted, whether or not it be de novo—and the gentleman, of course, is willing to leave that to the discretion and the good judgment of the committee that is set up—will not include provisions which the other bill carried and out of which grew a good deal of controversy in the House.

As I understand, the gentleman further has the impression that there will be no effort at piecemeal legislation, and that if any reorganization bill be considered it will be one bill reported by a committee the Speaker will appoint if the pending resolution is adopted.

Am I correctly interpreting the views of the gentleman?

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman is correct. I have confidence that the Speaker will make the proper selections in appointing the members of the committee. I do not know if it is the intent of the committee to bring in one bill or two or three bills. The committee, naturally, will use its judgment on that question.

Mr. COX. Of course, the committee that is set up must be given some latitude; the gentleman recognizes that.

Mr. SABATH. Why, of course.

Mr. COX. The gentleman does not know, of course, whom the Speaker will appoint, but the gentleman naturally has the right to assume the Speaker will draw on the experience gained during the past session.

Mr. SABATH. The resolution reads as follows:

That the Select Committee on Government Organization is authorized to continue its work begun under authority of House Resolution 60 of the Seventy-fifth Congress.

Naturally, that would presuppose that the Speaker would appoint the former members of that committee, who have given splendid service.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is proof of the saying that "hope springs eternal in the human breast." Ever since I have been in Congress there has been talk of the reorganization of the executive departments of the Government. Everyone admits they ought to be reorganized. The problem is to present a reorganization plan that will be acceptable.

As far as I am able to speak for the minority members of the Committee on Rules, they do not oppose this resolution, although there is one provision in it they would like to see changed. They feel there is work to be done by a committee such as this resolution proposes to continue in existence and they are hopeful this committee will be able to present to the House a reorganization bill that may be adopted. With that in view they favor the passage of this resolution.

Personally, I offered in the Committee on Rules an amendment to strike out the proviso which gives any legislation the committee may report a privileged status. I believe the committee should come before the Committee on Rules and ask for a rule to make in order the consideration of any bill the committee may report, the same as the standing committees of the House. However, the majority of the committee did not see fit to adopt that amendment.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to my friend the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COX. I believe it fair to the gentleman that the fact be developed that out of the proposal the gentleman offered grew the amendment the committee adopted, which it is proposed to offer in the consideration of the resolution. The gentleman will also concede, I believe, that that amendment, if adopted, will produce much the same results as if the gentleman's original amendment had been accepted.

Mr. MAPES. I may say to the gentleman that if the proposed legislation reported by the committee is to be given a privileged status, I see no objection to the amendment made by the committee. In fact, I think it ought to be adopted. For the benefit of those who have not studied the rules, that amendment is to make it possible for the committee to report legislation transferring bureaus or agencies from one department to another, and continuing the appropriation that has been made for such bureaus in the new department.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman will yield further, I may say the gentleman appreciates the fact that if this study is to be conducted, and if this committee, if set up, is to report a bill, the right to do the things provided for by the amendment to which the gentleman has referred is absolutely necessary.

Mr. MAPES. Yes; I believe that is a fair statement. If the legislation is adopted, of course, some such provision as that ought to be carried in it. The point I am making is that the entire matter ought to come before the Committee on Rules and a rule should be secured before the matter is brought up on the floor after the committee makes its report. In fairness, too, I perhaps should say that the resolution creating the committee in the last Congress did contain a similar provision, giving any bill reported by the committee a privileged status.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. The committee in making its report will have the right to suggest changes in one department or another and it will also have the right to delegate such power to the President of the United States, will it not?

Mr. MAPES. Of course, that will be a matter that the House itself will have to pass upon and determine eventually. What the committee will report, of course, I have no way of telling.

Mr. RICH. And any report that is made by the committee delegating power necessarily will be acted upon by the House before it becomes law.

Mr. MAPES. It will have to come before the House and be considered and debated and passed upon in the same way as any other legislation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I only intended to take a couple of minutes and I do not want to take too much time, but I shall be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The trouble with the resolution, as I see it, is that clause 4 of rule XXI prohibits the bringing in of appropriations in any resolution or bill from any committee other than the Committee on Appropriations. It will be impossible under this resolution, if the amendment is adopted, for us to prevent this special committee bringing in new appropriations or anything else of that sort, and it will also be impossible for us to prevent the committee from giving power to the President to transfer appropriations for purposes other than those for which they were intended when the appropriations were made by the Congress. I think this is a very serious thing.

Mr. MAPES. I think, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I should say that I have faith enough in my fellow men to think that the Committee on Reorganization will not attempt to bring in any new appropriations. My understanding is that the purpose of this provision is simply to make it possible for the committee to transfer agencies from one department to another and to continue the appropriation which has already been made, and not to attempt to suggest new appropriations.

Some of us have given thought and consideration to this matter of reorganization for a great many years, and, for one, I repeat what I said at the beginning, that I hope the committee this year will be able to bring in a report which will meet with the approval of a majority of the House.

I reserve the balance of my time, Mr. Speaker, and yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. SABATH] in his statement just now to the House, said he did not think there was any necessity for holding extensive public hearings on a reorganization bill because this might delay the consideration of such an important measure.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I certainly do yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SABATH. The chairman of the Rules Committee did not state any such thing. The chairman said he believes in granting fair hearings to all those who have anything of substance to present, but that he did not believe in holding hearings simply for the purpose of delaying legislation.

Mr. FISH. Is it not a fact that there were no public hearings in the last Congress on the reorganization bill? I understood the gentleman to say that public hearings might delay the consideration of this alleged vital and important measure.

I would like to point out to the House that by the adoption of the pending resolution that we will empower a select committee to consider the reorganization problem that has been before the Congress for 150 years. I cannot exactly understand how any public hearings will greatly delay the consideration of another reorganization bill.

Mr. SABATH. Does not the gentleman think that 150 years is time enough to consider the measure?

Mr. FISH. I am perfectly willing to wait another 150 years, and I think it may be advisable to wait longer than that if you have any idea of bringing into the House the same kind of reorganization bill that you did in the last Congress, which was an abomination of desolation and which was thrown out of the House by the vote of many Members on the majority side itself. I presume now, however, like the King of France, the Democratic majority will march up the hill on the reorganization bill and discard almost everything they had in the bill last year and march down again with a new measure. This is the reason, I assume, the minority is not opposing this resolution, although I believe they should oppose that part of the resolution which provides a privileged status.

I see no reason for this Select Committee on Government Organization having a privileged status. The only committees in the House that have such status are the Ways and Means and on general appropriations the Appropriations

Committee and the Committee on Accounts. As a general proposition there are very few precedents for giving any special or select committee a privileged status to bring in legislation. There is no opportunity, under the rules, for me to offer an amendment to strike out the last four lines of the pending resolution which would do away with this privileged status except to vote down the previous question. I submit that unless this committee agrees to have public hearings, it is an absurdity to give them a privileged status to bring in such legislation without public hearings and then present it to the House when the House itself would be utterly ignorant of what the bill was based on and would be unable to have the benefit of any public hearings on the bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I have limited time, but I yield for a brief question.

Mr. COX. The gentleman referred to the statement of the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the chairman of that committee undertook to correct what the gentleman from New York said. If I understand the position of the chairman of the Committee on Rules, if I understood what he said, it is that as far as he knows no cut-and-dried procedure will be laid out to be followed by any committee that will be set up. The gentleman speaks of a working committee. He says that whatever committee is set up ought to conduct public hearings. That committee does not now exist, and, of course, we have no way of foretelling who will be placed on that committee. Therefore we cannot well disclose what procedure they will follow.

Mr. FISH. I think the gentleman and myself are in accord, and I believe the chairman of the Committee on Rules is with us in that we want public hearings on the reorganization bill, but we want some assurance now that there will be public hearings.

Mr. COX. Is not the gentleman willing to rest upon his rights to prevail upon the committee which will be set up to have public hearings? The gentleman does not want the House now to seek to tie the hands of the committee or a committee that has not yet been brought into existence?

Mr. FISH. No; but I would like to have assurance from some member of that committee that there will be public hearings on this so-called important legislation.

This is a continuation of the old committee, as I understand it, or at least the same members will be on it.

Mr. COX. This will be a new committee, as I understand the resolution.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, in the few minutes that I have remaining I want to explain to the new Members of the House that the reorganization bill that came before the last Congress had many items in it that were never included in any reorganization bill before. The Republicans are not opposed to efficiency in Government, or to the reorganization of the different bureaus of the Government. Republican Presidents have made that recommendation in the past, in the interest of good government. We opposed the last bill because it included control of the Civil Service, the Comptroller General's Office, and welfare funds. Why are we pushing this legislation at the present time? We have been in session for 1 month, and the Congress has not done one thing to restore confidence and recovery or to put any of the 12,000,000 American people back to work.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I challenge anyone to show any demand for this legislation or who is asking for the legislation. Are the farm groups, is the American Federation of Labor, are the businessmen of the country asking for consideration of a new reorganization bill at this time? I do not believe any Republican on this side has had a single letter asking him to support the reorganization bill, and I doubt if any such demand has been received even by the Democrats.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. For just a question.

Mr. WARREN. When the gentleman says that nothing has been done, I call attention to the fact that the Republican Party in this House has delayed the organization of the

House, and quite naturally so, because they did not have their committee assignments ready for election until just last week.

Mr. FISH. I do not think that is a fair or accurate statement.

I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I want to state that the Democrats had their committee assignments ready only 2 days previous to the announcement of our committee appointments.

Mr. FISH. I think that is an unquestioned fact.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, entirely apart from the question of whether any particular groups about the country have been demanding legislation, is not the gentleman prepared to concede and does he not contend that there is need for reorganization?

Mr. FISH. I concede that, and I think the Republicans do. They are in favor of economy and efficiency in government; and if this committee brings in a proper bill, we will support it; but they have not done it in the past, and it is almost too much to hope they will do anything different in the future.

Mr. COX. Then the gentleman concedes that there is need for legislation along this line?

Mr. FISH. For proper legislation, yes; but if this new reorganization bill gives more power to the President, I shall oppose it. I think the time has come to take back some of the powers that we have already given to the President, and restore representative government in the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX. The gentleman of course concedes that whatever committee is set up will perform as the servants of the House, and without regard to any report they may make, it will be in the determination of the House as to what should be done.

Mr. FISH. I say to the gentleman that I can only judge what will happen from what has happened in the past, and we know what happened to the chairman of the Committee on Rules [Mr. O'Connor] in the last Congress, who opposed the reorganization bill. He was "purged" by his own party leader. I have little faith in any reorganization bill that emanates from the present administration. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, the only thing the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] failed to tell the House and what he always says is that he comes from the home district of the President of the United States, upon whom he has been venting his wrath and spleen for the last 6 years, in and out of this body.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] raised no question 2 years ago about the setting up of this committee or its privileged status. This committee was created by the unanimous vote of the House 2 years ago, with very little debate and with no roll call. It is now a late day for even our friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] to come in and say that this committee should have no privileged status, because without that privileged status there is no use of even setting it up.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], are the two best exhibits we have in the House as to why this committee should be vested with a privileged status. Back in 1920, under the administration of Woodrow Wilson, with the Republican Party in control of both branches of the Government, a reorganization committee was set up. It was an able and distinguished committee. Serving on that committee was the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Mapes, the former Representative from Pennsylvania, Dr. Temple; and the former Representative from Virginia, Hon. R. Walton Moore. Serving on the Senate committee were Senator Smoot; Senator Wadsworth, of New York; and Senator Harrison of Mississippi. During three Congresses that committee met, trying to formulate legislation, and in the Sixty-eighth Congress the gentleman from Michigan [Mr.

MAPES] brought into this House a well considered and a well prepared bill, meeting the situation as it existed at that time. What then confronted him? He found that through some oversight that committee had not been given a privileged status, and their labors were all in vain, and they never could get it to the floor of the House.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly.

Mr. MAPES. Just to keep the record straight, the report came up in a short session of the Congress. It was the joint action of the House and Senate. The Senate members of the joint committee attempted to bring the bill up in the Senate and were defeated in that attempt. The House organization, including at that time Speaker Gillette and Majority Leader Longworth, had consented to have the matter brought up in the House until that action in the Senate; but after the action in the Senate, of course, it would have been futile in the short session to have brought it up in the House.

Mr. WARREN. The fact is that the bill was never considered in the House of Representatives.

Now, answering the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], about the amendment to this resolution waiving a point of order, in the act of 1932, in which the Congress gave the then President Hoover the right to reorganize the Government, the most far-reaching act of this kind ever delegated to any President of the United States, an act that gave Mr. Hoover the right to absolutely destroy and change and wipe out and turn into a mere shell not only bureaus but independent departments, departments headed by a Cabinet officer, all of which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] voted for, there was contained a provision that the President, in shifting those bureaus and agencies, should have the right to also shift the personnel and to transfer the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made. That is the only reason in the world why the amendment is offered to waive a point of order—not to appropriate money, but in case a consolidation or reorganization is made among several bureaus, to merely transfer the funds that have already been appropriated by the Congress, in order not to keep a new bureau suspended in the air and without operation.

I here and now assure the gentleman from New York that that is the sole and only purpose of this amendment.

Now, in answer to some questions which the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], it is probably out of place at this time for me to say this: In the first place, it is with some diffidence that I discuss this matter, because I happen to be on the committee; and if I had my own likes to satisfy, I assure the House I would like to get off of it today. It is nothing in the world but a headache and much work for me. Acting solely on my own initiative, for the last month I have been preparing a bill. I have now finished the drafting of that bill. After the gentleman from Missouri, the distinguished chairman of this committee [Mr. COCHRAN], sees that measure, if he approves it, certainly he is entitled to introduce it, because I have no pride of authorship whatever. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] knows more about the inner workings of the departments of the Government than any other man in either branch of the Congress.

I believe that the bill which I have prepared will be a common meeting ground for Members on both sides of the aisle to approach this problem. I realize that when we had this fierce debate last year, men honestly differed about some of the things contained in the measure, although I must call attention to the fact that on August 17, 1937, the House of Representatives, by a vote of 283 to 75, passed the major part of this program, amounting to approximately 80 percent of it, by a nonpartisan vote. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] voted for it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] voted for it. So did Messrs. ANDREWS, BURDICK, CASE, ENGLEBRIGHT, HALLECK, REECE of Tennessee, STEFAN, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WOLVERTON].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WARREN. Certainly I yield, and am very glad to acknowledge the splendid speech made at that time by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. To keep the record straight again, the bill, of course, as it passed the House did not contain the provision abolishing the Civil Service Commission or the General Accounting Office.

Mr. WARREN. I made that clear. The gentleman is entirely correct. If the gentleman will have just a little patience I believe that after this committee is reconstituted—and I honestly believe it—we can bring in here a measure that will meet the accord of the majority of the Members of the House. I, therefore, hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the previous question is moved on this resolution we will vote for the previous question and the adoption of the resolution. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the re-creation of the Committee on Government Organization. The thing to which I object in this resolution is that it carries a provision, in an amendment the committee has reported, that it shall be in order to consider any such bills or resolutions so reported without the intervention of any point of order as provided in clause 4 of rule XXI. Clause 4 of rule XXI prohibits any bill or joint resolution carrying appropriations coming from any committee not having jurisdiction to report appropriations. This provision would give this committee power to set up new organizations and provide appropriations for them without consideration by the Committee on Appropriations. It would give it authority to delegate to the President power to transfer those appropriations.

In my opinion, if we are going to pass any reorganization bill it should, in the first place, provide for the reorganization directly. In the second place, I believe that no bill should authorize the President to transfer appropriations. If the House should see fit—and I think they will not—to give the President power to perform reorganizations, the power to appropriate for the new set-up should be given to the deficiency committee of the Appropriations Committee. The Congress has never failed to provide funds for any organization needing them and it would not in this instance. There would be a check and an opportunity for the new organization set-up to justify what it needed. Instead of having the funds provided by an Executive order it is my thought that the Congress should preserve its control over the money. The only way it can do this is to vote down the previous question and refuse to adopt such an amendment as the committee has brought in, the amendment waiving points of order under clause 4 of rule XXI on resolutions brought in by this reorganization committee. I hope the previous question will be voted down so that the amendment may be considered by the House and then I shall ask that this be done when we reach the appropriate stage in consideration of the resolution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] referred to the reorganization bill, killed in the last Congress, as an abomination of legislation. The day after the defeat of that bill I procured a copy of the New York Times, reputed to be the greatest newspaper in the world and certainly not a New Deal organ, to see what it had to say about the action of the House.

The New York Times said editorially that the reorganization bill was a good bill, but it had been defeated because Congress did not feel like turning over such powers to a "dictator." I am not able to add that up. At any rate, it praised the bill.

So far as the committee that handled that bill is concerned I may say that the bill was most ably presented and defended. In 10 years in Congress I have never seen a bill more ably managed. Read the debates on that bill in the last Congress. The bill was handled by the gentleman

from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. VINSON], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. Read those debates and you will agree with me that it was defended, explained, and justified in masterly fashion. Every attack on it failed.

After the action of the House on that occasion, senselessly stampeded into killing a good bill framed by its own Members, I said that if I were President of the United States I would throw the reorganization of the Government into the lap of the Congress and then I would just come up here, get a ringside seat, and laugh myself to death. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, this is a delicate subject for me to talk about, inasmuch as I was a member of the committee. What was the procedure? Secret sessions for months, the public not allowed to know of the extraordinary demands made. In the minds of the public there arose a great fear lest extraordinary powers be granted the President in view of most extraordinary demands immediately preceding. The thought of granting those powers to the Executive caused the Nation to make such expostulations that even with a minority of only 80 on the Republican side, aided by the conscience of the majority, the bill was defeated.

The new Members will be told that we gave similar extraordinary powers to Mr. Hoover. We did give him extraordinary powers of recommendation only. I suggest that you read the recommendations he made in December 1932. Certainly none of his recommendations were extraordinary, but the Democrats were in the majority. They had the power to set aside anything Mr. Hoover might recommend; and they quickly, without much apparent consideration, threw all his recommendations aside, notwithstanding they were carefully thought out and reasonable recommendations.

The thought I want to express is that last year this was a joint committee, and another branch had equal authority. Members of the majority in the House have taken the floor this morning to say that they have thought out a measure that will probably be satisfactory, but I ask: How about the measures being thought out by Members of another body, measures which are promised will have in them some measure of economy?

May I say to the new Members that there were 18 on this committee, and there were only 4 of the minority selected. Yet when it came up in that spectacular debate last year the cry of the leaders on the other side was, "Look out for the Republicans; they will get you if you don't look out." Now we have 160 Members on this side, and I think we can be more persuasive than before. But I for one hope that no matter what recommendation comes from the President, it will be brought here for our acceptance before he can proceed to make changes. Transferring particular departments of the Government and at the same time changing their names enables the President to get rid of those whom he does not like. The heads would roll. I have seen such reorganizations in my own State.

There are many features of the bill that were presented last year that will probably not again be presented. I imagine we will have a mild, noncontroversial bill presented to the House. But what will come from another body and later acted upon in conference we do not know. I hope that we may have public hearings, that all may understand the changes contemplated. If I happen to be appointed to that committee, I do not wish my tongue to be tied so that my public could not know fully the powers granted to the Executive.

Mr. COX. The gentleman is not protesting the adoption of the pending resolution, is he?

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, no; simply an expression of doubt.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, may I address myself particularly to my colleagues on this side of the aisle who were not in this body in January 1937, when the President, on the

12th day of that month, sent us a message dealing with reorganization? That is a little more than 2 years ago. Two days later, on January 14, 1937, there came before this body for consideration Resolution No. 60, and I think we went along pretty well and in good faith on all this without scarcely anticipating what was going to happen.

After the appointment of that committee and sessions behind closed doors they came in with the celebrated reorganization bill. There was a great deal of language contained therein about transferring and retransferring functions and agencies, about grouping and regrouping functions, about abolishing agencies, with some exceptions; and when the bill came upon the floor for consideration, that is when the fight began. Our colleagues over on this side were instrumental in large part in finally putting an end to that which appealed to the country as a whole as a kind of abomination. You can then understand the skittishness that now prevails. You can understand the certain sense of delicacy that persists in this House today. It is because we had our fingers burned once before. That is the answer to the gentleman from North Carolina.

I suppose it will be all right to go along with the present Resolution No. 60, but do not forget it is a continuation of Resolution No. 60 of January 14, 1937, which considered all matters embraced in the message of the President of the United States on reorganization. It may be an innocuous bill, but mark well the observation made by the gentleman from Massachusetts, when the bill goes over to the other side of the Capitol and falls into the hands of the Senate: What will the Members of that body do? What will the conference report be like when it comes back to this body? Suppose it comes back in the last hectic days of the session, when we are here until late at night and there is so little deliberation on vital and important matters. That is the reason we are skittish today and that is why I favor, as does the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the elimination from this bill of language which provides for the transfer of appropriations.

It is our last crack at this thing if they do not do a good job and it is engrossed upon the law books. Let us not barter away that little power. Let us vote down the previous question and see whether it cannot be amended so that we may still hold on to the money bags and have a fighting chance for our "white alley" when the time comes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I cannot see the wisdom of discussing what a committee which has not even been created is going to do. The committee is not at the present time in existence. This resolution provides for re-creating the select committee.

I want to use my time to answer a few statements that have been made. First, may I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] that this committee is not going to appropriate any money nor can it under the language referred to by them. There is no authority there to appropriate money. It simply provides that when the President takes one bureau and transfers it to, or consolidates it with another, along with that bureau goes the money that the Appropriations Committee has already provided for the fiscal year. That is all it means. Unless the money also is transferred the agency could not function.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. This rule would permit original appropriations to be brought in by that committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. Nothing of the kind. It only provides for the transfer to go along with the agency when it is consolidated with another agency of the money that the gentleman's committee has already given the bureau for the fiscal year. I know I am correct in that. I agree with the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN].

Mr. WARREN. The sole purpose that we have that provision in there as an amendment to the rule is to include in any future reorganization bill section 404 of the act of 1932, the same reorganization powers given to Mr. Hoover. That is the sole and only purpose, as far as I know, of the amendment being offered to this resolution.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] spoke about the recommendations of Mr. Hoover. I voted to give your President, Mr. Hoover, who was also my President, although not of my political party, the power to reorganize this Government. More power than was ever given to a President before or since. But when did he make this recommendation? After he was repudiated by the American people. Following the election in 1932, he sent during the short session of Congress his recommendation, and I ask you to read it. On both sides of the aisle there was a demand that the committee bring in a resolution immediately that would prevent the recommendation's going through. We held hearings—copies of the hearings are in my committee room—and I called before the committee Colonel Roop, who was Mr. Hoover's Director of the Budget. What did he say? He recommended to the committee—and it is in black and white in the hearings—that it was his opinion that Congress should not permit the Executive orders to go into force, and that President Roosevelt, who had just been elected, should be allowed to do the reorganizing. Why, Mr. Hoover even recommended taking the rivers and harbors work away from the Army engineers. That was condemned in every section of the country and by 9 out of every 10 Members of this body. Under the power we gave Mr. Hoover he could abolish not only bureaus but departments, and he likewise had the power the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] now complains of to transfer moneys already appropriated. You did not complain when we gave such powers to Mr. Hoover.

Now, in reference to holding hearings on the bills we considered in the last Congress. The joint committee held hearings and then the Senate committee held hearings. I believe we sat in the joint committee hearings for about 3 weeks. We went over to the Senate Office Building every morning. If you will take the time to read those hearings, you will find that Mr. TABER and Mr. GIFFORD participated and asked hundreds of questions. I never heard of any requests from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] to be heard by the committee. The only two men who spoke of public hearings were the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], who were members of the select committee. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] know that there is in the public library a book of some 1,500 or more pages, which contains the record of the hearings held by their committee under the resolution to which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WARREN] called your attention. There are also in the library copies of other hearings that have been held from time to time by various committees of the Congress on the general subject of reorganizing this Government. Months were consumed in holding the hearings by the committee Mr. MAPES and Mr. WADSWORTH were members of.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York. Mr. WADSWORTH. Is the gentleman referring to the attempt to reorganize the executive departments made by a joint committee of the Congress back in 1924?

Mr. COCHRAN. I refer to the committee of which the gentleman from New York was a member when he was a Member of the United States Senate. I believe Senator Smoot was the chairman of that committee, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. WADSWORTH. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] was also a member of that committee appointed by the Speaker. Your committee held hearings, and the book containing the record of those hearings contains over 1,500 pages.

Mr. WADSWORTH. If the gentleman will yield further, why could not the committee in the last Congress have held like hearings? We held open public hearings.

Mr. COCHRAN. We had the benefit of the hearings of the gentleman's committee. They were so lengthy and had taken up so much time that all we had to do was read them over. As a result, we knew what was in the minds of the people.

There has been more misleading statements circulated in this country in reference to the reorganization bills than has ever been circulated concerning any legislation that was ever presented to the Congress. One Member of this Congress went out to my own city in the fall of 1937 and made a speech to a large national organization of traffic men holding a convention, begging them to get busy on their Congressmen and not let the House of Representatives pass the reorganization bill, which he told them would give the President the power to destroy the Interstate Commerce Commission. I found his speech in the paper the next morning, relating how he had pleaded with them and urged the convention to adopt resolutions to the effect that they were not in favor of destroying the Interstate Commerce Commission and wanted it left alone. I secured the bill and quoted the specific provision in that bill that kept the President of the United States from touching the Interstate Commerce Commission, as well as other regulatory bodies. Then I got the *RECORD* and turned to the roll call on that bill in August 1937, and lo! and behold, I found the name of that Member of Congress shown as voting for the very bill he was asking those people to help defeat. He did not even know the bill had been passed and that it was in the Senate, and he was telling the people to have the House beat the bill, a bill he had voted for. This is a sample of the kind of bunk that was given to the people of this country.

When I went home last summer I discussed this matter with many, many people, and there was not one person with whom I discussed it that did not admit he did not know what was in the bill he was talking about when he sent a wire or wrote a letter seeking the defeat of the reorganization bill. I went before one organization that sent me a telegram signed by 200 members, and made a speech. They told me to select my own subject, and I talked about the reorganization bill because they had sent me the telegram. There was great confusion among the members of that organization in an attempt to find out who signed their names to that telegram. It developed the secretary signed their names to the telegram and sent it without their permission. [Applause.]

I answered every letter that came to me about the bill, and hundreds replied they had never written or wired me nor authorized anyone to sign their name to any protest. It was inspired, misleading propaganda.

There is one way to reorganize this Government and only one way. I say that because Congress will never do it. If it is to be done, power must be given to a President who will do it, and the time to do it is right now. Businessmen who complain about expenses of the Government, who demand that we simplify procedure, can come to the conclusion now they are going to continue to complain unless Congress gives the President the power to put his house in order. The Constitution and the Congress hold the President responsible for the conduct of the executive branch of the Government. Why, then, should we not give him a set-up that will enable him to efficiently and economically do his job. No greater blunder was ever committed by the Congress than the defeat of the reorganization bill last year.

President after President, Republicans and Democrats, for the last 40 years have urged a reorganization of the executive branch of the Government. It has been too long delayed.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the typographical error in line 11 of the resolution, where the letter "n" has been omitted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact I believe nearly all of us are in favor of the passage of the resolution,

I move the previous question on the resolution and the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question on the resolution and the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 153, noes 102.

So the previous question was ordered.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution as amended.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Under a special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I discussed on this floor provisions of the free homestead program as incorporated in H. R. 1675, introduced by myself at the beginning of this session of the Congress, an identical measure having also been presented in the other body of the Congress jointly by the two Senators from my State of Georgia. Since making those remarks, several of my colleagues have approached me expressing their interest in this legislation, several of them, much to my astonishment, suggesting that this proposal is somewhat un-American and contrary to the doctrines that have prevailed in this country for a long period of years.

Today I wish briefly to inform my colleagues more in detail as to the real provisions of this legislation and to recall to them that rather than being un-American the proposal which I have brought forward here is in strict harmony with the land policies and with the fundamental principles that have prevailed in this country from the time of its infancy.

I have here, and I ask, Mr. Speaker, permission to insert this document in the *RECORD*, figures presented to me by the General Land Office showing the total acreage of the public domain of this Nation that has been granted under the Free Homestead Acts, since their adoption, beginning in 1862, and showing the acreage for the respective States.

You will find there has been a total of over 500,000,000 acres of the public domain granted to private citizens for entry, free of debt, under that act.

In addition, I have investigated regarding the Thirteen Original Colonies and the great State of Texas, the domain of these respective governmental units never having come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

There has been prepared data by our legislative reference bureau, giving a brief history of the public-land policies of each of these respective units. This data is too comprehensive to ask that it be placed in the *RECORD*, but it is here in my possession for your examination at any time, and you will find, as I have found, that in every State and colony of this Nation there has always prevailed a policy of free homesteads. Free land for free labor has always been a cardinal principle in every civil unit under our Federal Government, and a major portion of the land not only in these public-domain States, but in the colonies, was granted to the private citizens free of debt.

Mr. Speaker, we have been legislating here in an emergency manner, appropriating billions and billions of dollars to meet an emergency. Today, our rural population is in just as desperate a condition as it was when we began to make these appropriations.

It is unfortunate that the Federal Government failed, when it made the original free homestead provision, to throw a safeguard around the farmers of this country so that they could not mortgage or encumber their premises; so that those little, independent farm units occupied by free, liberty-loving American citizens, could be preserved; so that those families could continue to earn an honest living by the sweat of their brow in freedom and in independence. Having failed to throw these safeguards around these units, we find that the age-old practices of industry and of commerce and of finance have crept in and have

assaulted these free farm units until today they are overcome by mortgages and debts, with the result that over two-thirds of the farm population today are either tenants or else have such heavy mortgages over their homes that they are in many instances in worse condition than if they were tenants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I again assert that it is absurd for us as Congressmen to hope to continue to preserve free institutions among a people who do not themselves enjoy their freedom. It is impossible to maintain free government among tenants and among serfs. If we will take a small portion of the money that we are throwing away, in many instances, in useless undertakings, and in other instances in experiments, which are doomed before they are initiated, and go back to the traditional American policy of purchasing farm units and making them again available for destitute farm families, and providing that these farm units cannot be mortgaged or encumbered, and then placing farm families on these farms, we will find that we have then initiated a program which will begin to lead us out of this chaotic condition and place us again in a position of independence and in a position where the people themselves will demand free government and where the people themselves will demand economical government.

A Member of Congress is inclined to vote, regardless of what party he belongs to, according to the wishes of the majority of his constituents. If a majority of those constituents have lost all their hope, if they have no hope of ever getting possession of a little plot of land for themselves as a home, if they have no hope of ever again being placed in the position of economic independence where they can have a home to call their own, then they do not care whether government remains democratic or not, they do not care whether you balance the Budget or not, whether you initiate soil conservation and various soil-benefit programs or not. It is to their benefit to get every dollar of the public funds that they can possibly get, or of funds from any other source, so they are prone to demand of their Representatives and Senators extravagant expenditures. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, if this Congress will, rather than continue to spend forever and forever, going forward to a condition of complete chaos, if we will take a small portion of these funds and enact legislation that will gradually bring the people back to ownership of their own little farm units, we will find that we will have started in the right direction. Every time we place a farm family on a little piece of farm land and preserve and protect that homestead for that family against the encroachments of greed and avarice of the financial interests of the country, we will have made a good liberty-loving American citizen out of that man and his family. A free farm, owned and occupied by a free citizen and his family, is the ideal breeding place for the germ of human liberty. It is the cornerstone of free government, and we can orate all we please, and cry over the condition of the people of this country as much as we wish, but so long as we fail to return to the American doctrine of free land for free labor, providing for every human within the bounds of this country as he is born under the plan of the Divine Creator—as long as we fail to give him an opportunity to have a place in which to stand, a place in which to live, a place where he may earn his meat and bread on an equal basis with all other mankind—then so long will we fail to properly function as a legislative body representing a great free people. [Applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Does the gentleman's bill provide any safeguard for those farmers which will prevent the politician from taxing the farms away from them?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill does not provide any safeguard to keep the politician from taxing these farm units away from them, but the politician under our representative system of government is elected by the people, and when the people in the respective districts see

that it is to their benefit by ownership of their own homes to keep down taxes, then you will find the politicians advocating the reduction of taxes, and until that time does come, there is no advantage to a politician to advocate it, because the people themselves have lost their homes and holdings and are not primarily interested in reducing taxes. A majority of the farmers, who are the backbone of this Nation, are bankrupt today, and there is no hope on earth for them under any legislation so far enacted to regain their homes, to get out of this condition of bankruptcy.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. HAWKS. Will the gentleman agree then that during the past number of years under the Triple A, agriculture in this country has not progressed to the point where it should have progressed.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I agree to that, and not only do I agree to that but I stated here a few days ago that this question was one of the crying issues in America and had been so from the time of the Louisiana Purchase until 1862, when we finally adopted the free homestead plan to protect the farmers, and your Republican Party grew into power because it had the foresight to adopt a program of this kind, as I read into the RECORD a few days ago; and so long as the Republican Party remained true to the farmers of the country it was in power, but when that party forgot the source of its greatness the people of America rose and trampled it under foot and today they have wrested that power from that party hoping that another party will bring to them again the relief they need. But, although both parties have voted for the emergency legislation, which has done great good, yet no party has yet initiated a national program which will again help solve the problems of the farmers of this country. Today I am pleading with all of you for the adoption of such a program.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman speaks about the A. A. A. As one Member on this side of the aisle I voted and worked against crop-control legislation. I ask the gentleman this question: What is the financial participation or obligation of the individual to be helped by the Government in placing that individual and a member of his family upon this land?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. In that respect I do not propose to change the law at all. I propose to again make operative the Homestead Act of 1862, which is still the law, and under which over 500,000,000 acres of land passed into private ownership and over 3,000,000 farm families secured free farm homesteads.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Then when the gentleman is attacked for bringing in an un-American program, it is just a continuation of the law which has been carried forward through the years?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Absolutely; with this one additional provision, that should have been written into the original act, that these homestead units cannot become the subject of barter. They cannot be mortgaged or encumbered, but shall be kept inviolate, where farm families can live and earn for themselves the necessities of life.

I want to tell you another good feature about this.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Would the gentleman include as a part of the free land all of the farms that have been foreclosed by the Federal land bank during the last 3 years?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will read this bill, he will see that it provides that where foreclosures have been made since January 1, 1920, and the land is still in the hands of the mortgagee, it will come under the provisions, and the original mortgagor will be given a prior right to the homesteading of his original home.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that at the present time if a mortgagor loses his farm to the

Federal land bank, the Federal land bank will not sell it back to him unless he pays the full amount of the indebtedness, plus interest, taxes, and other costs, but that the Federal land bank will sell it to other outside parties for about half the price or whatever they can get for it.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I appreciate the gentleman contributing that observation.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. I am in sympathy with the gentleman's viewpoint, but the gentleman talks about having a free farm citizenry who own their own homes, yet he takes away from them the right to dispose of that land. Has that not always been considered as an incident of property—that is, the right to sell?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Particularly by the financial interests. If the gentleman will study the history of his own State, he will find that when a division was opened by the General Land Office for private entry, the first thing you had was the financial interests of Wall Street plunging in, attempting to mortgage and encumber and buy away from those farmers the farm homesteads. That is one of the fundamental principles of government, to protect citizens, to protect the weak, and provide opportunities for the weak to live in independence, equally with the strong.

It was never intended, under free government, for us to provide primarily for the strong financial interests of this country. Neither was it intended that we should destroy the strong financial interests, but the true principle of our free representative government is to let the strong grow as strong as they may, let the rich grow as rich as they please, but put safeguards there where never can the strong or rich oppress the weak and needy. The only foundation upon which you can build such a structure is keep land always open, so that when a man loses his job in the city, when all his hope is gone in the various industrial pursuits and in the various professional pursuits, when, as we know, he has still got to eat and he has still got to stand on earth if he lives, when those conditions come about there is always a city of refuge, a gateway for him to flee from the oppressions of the mighty and the rich. The only gateway, the only city of refuge you can properly provide for him is a little plot of soil, where he can carry his family and live in freedom and independence. That piece of soil should not be a question of barter and trade.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. That, in effect, is treating the farmer as an incompetent, is it not? We do not put those restrictions upon any other group in this country except the Indians, as a group, or those who have been adjudged to be incompetent. Is it the gentleman's opinion that those who take up these homesteads should be treated as incompetents? I am not asking that facetiously. I am asking that in all sincerity.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. No, sir. I do not propose that they should be treated as incompetents, but the gentleman knows that from the dawn of time the fight has always been the strong against the weak. Our system of government was set up so as to safeguard the strong in their strength and at the same time protect the weak in their weakness. Now, our system of government does not provide that you should go out here and take a weak man and set him up and take away from the strong man and give of his resources to that weak man, but it does provide, as a land of opportunity, that you keep open always to that weak man the opportunity to earn an honest living in political equality and in economic equality with the strong and the rich.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McGRANERY). The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has a special order. If that is agreeable to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HAWKS. I believe the gentleman knows I am very sympathetic to this matter.

Does not the gentleman agree with me that the bankers, the local bankers in our small communities—I am not talking about the international bankers or the big bankers, but about the conscientious, hard-working banker in the local community—does not the gentleman agree that during the past years this local, conscientious, hard-working banker has tried to work with the weak, has tried to provide them money, has tried to help them finance their farms?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. They have done good work along that line.

Mr. HAWKS. I would like to have an appreciation of the local banker, the small-town banker really impressed on the minds of the Members.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I am not meaning to condemn any institution, for I think we have all been caught in the jaws of a vice. I think nobody is particularly responsible. We have just had an economic system that has drifted along with the financial institutions trying to get all the collateral they could, all the holdings they could until they have driven the producer of the raw products, the man who is the foundation of our whole economic structure, the farmer, to a condition of serfdom where he has lost his farm home, where he has lost his means of livelihood, where he has lost nearly everything that he must have in order to earn bread and butter so that he can live and his family may eat.

I am simply proposing, sirs, that we again open up the land to the average citizen of America. I am not asking that you give him one penny. I am not asking that you put one citizen on the dole. I am asking that we again provide an opportunity for that citizen himself to procure the necessities of life. If the gentleman does not like the provision of my bill prohibiting mortgages or encumbrances of the land, if the gentleman is really interested in helping to reestablish the independent homestead units of this country, I would be delighted to work with him. I will welcome any cooperation in behalf of this principle.

Mr. HOPE. I may say to the gentleman that I am not sure I disagree with him, but I did want to get his viewpoint. I would like to ask the gentleman another question if he would be kind enough to yield. I do not want to take too much of his time.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. It has been true in the past, has it not, that ownership of land and the ability to mortgage it has in many instances furnished farmers with a source of credit they would not otherwise have had, and that in many, many instances the debt has been paid off?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. In very few instances, comparatively, have the mortgages been repaid, and I doubt the wisdom of the vast majority of the mortgages. It is true that banks in many instances have made loans with farms as collateral; however, farm land is considered a frozen asset, and it is not good business for any bank to use farm land as collateral, because the money is then tied up indefinitely. With the production credit associations and the emergency crop and feed loan organizations, and other lending agencies, we find that the average farmer has all the help he could possibly hope for or need under normal conditions without a farm mortgage.

Mr. HAWKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HAWKS. Is it not a fact that the subsidies of the Government during the last 4 years of the New Deal have just about destroyed the credit of the small farmer of this country?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I would not care to argue that point. I am inclined to think that a great deal of good has come to the farmers out of the expenditure of these funds, but it has not yet touched the basic spot; it has not yet

offered a program that is going to help little old John Jones back in Montgomery County, Ga., to get on his feet to the point where he and his family can live without calling upon the Government for financial aid or for meat and bread. This is what we need to do. This could be done not only for John Jones in Montgomery County, Ga., in my First District, but for people in every other district of this country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I understood the gentleman correctly, he proposes to let these men have this land. Does the gentleman intend also to start them farming by way of providing tools and equipment?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. My proposition goes back to the old original homestead law under which the gentleman's State was developed. Was it provided then?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Never mind about that; I am asking about present conditions.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Was it provided in those days? It is the same law that I want to put into operation again.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I understand that the gentleman is going to give me land because I cannot make a living today, and have no money. Is he as well as buying the land going to equip me with tools that I may make a living from the land?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. The gentleman can introduce a bill to that effect, if he wishes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is that the gentleman's purpose?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. It is not my intention now to debate that feature. My plan would operate under the homestead act that is the same today as it has been since it was enacted. I am just proposing that we make land available to the people under the provisions of the homestead act that has proven so successful for three-quarters of a century.

As to the cost of the proposition that is nothing new, for in numerous instances this Nation has bought land and given it to farm families free of debt. In 1803 we bought over 500,000,000 acres of land from France.

We took this land and divided it into homesteads.

We bought land from Spain in 1819. We bought land from Russia in 1867. We bought land from Texas. We bought land from Mexico. We bought land from numerous sources and opened that land up for free entry not only to American citizens but to citizens throughout the world. From 1862 to 1885, under the Homestead Act of 1862, history records that one of the greatest migrations of mankind in the history of the world took place. During that time distressed families from Europe sought refuge in the free domain of America, and it was from the settlement made by those Europeans that sprung many of your great districts. Many of you gentlemen sitting here are descendants of some of those homesteaders. You know the benefits of a free-land policy. Yet why do you gentlemen sit silently in your seats when the benefits of a free homestead policy are rapidly vanishing? When those benefits vanish all free government will vanish. Why do you sit here in your seats and fail to raise your voice to amend the free-homestead acts that brought about the greatness of your districts so that like benefits may be worked out for your descendants?

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, we bought these lands from foreign countries and gave them to farm families. Can there be anything wrong in again buying land and again giving it to farm families? I am simply proposing today to help the farmer. He is in a hopeless plight insofar as land and the farms are concerned. The little banks are in a hopeless plight. The Government itself and the lending agencies, all of us, have got caught in a jam. The lending agencies do not want the land. They want the people put back to where they can be prosperous and where they can do business.

The Government does not want the land, neither do the various agencies that have taken it over; yet the people cannot live on this land under present conditions, and they are unable to purchase it back.

Is it not the duty of the Congress, when everybody is in a jam, to do something to relieve the situation instead of refusing to see the situation as it is? We are day after day voting away billions and billions of the resources of this country, driving ourselves deeper and deeper into bankruptcy. Is it not the part of common sense and wisdom to attempt to unravel these distressed conditions and help financial institutions get relieved of their burden and help the farmer get back into a position of economic independence and, as a matter of fact, help all of us where we can again regulate our own affairs in a normal way? It appears to me a most simple, fundamental American proposition to do that. I am proposing such a course in this measure.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman has been fighting for this legislation for several years, and I have been very much interested in many of the arguments he has presented on the floor of the House. The trouble of the farmers in my State is not so much the acquiring of new land as to keep the land they already have. They are losing their land by the hundreds of thousands of acres.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. How are they going to keep it?

Mr. STEFAN. I would suggest the gentleman read the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I am not objecting to the gentleman's proposal. In fact, I commend the gentleman from Nebraska and the other Members who are sponsoring this legislation, for the serious effort you are making to really help your farmers out of their present plight. I congratulate you for the time, thought, and study you are devoting to this vital problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a document mentioned during my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PETERSON]?

There was no objection.

The tabulation referred to follows:

Tabulation showing number and acreage embraced in allowed original homestead entries and final homestead entries (including commuted entries), by States, from the passage of the Homestead Act to June 30, 1936

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES

States	Original		Final	
	Number	Acres	Number	Acres
Alabama.....	76,764	7,924,032	44,965	4,901,878
Arizona.....	40,025	8,904,623	19,595	3,815,206
Arkansas.....	146,528	14,981,114	76,216	8,297,864
California.....	134,421	21,668,914	71,164	10,981,430
Colorado.....	206,869	42,188,985	111,725	22,462,510
Dakota Territory.....	116,870	18,072,796	60,672	9,539,454
Florida.....	55,654	6,366,409	31,275	3,702,707
Idaho.....	105,810	18,695,495	60,399	9,592,822
Illinois.....	95	7,392	76	5,865
Indiana.....	40	2,117	29	1,796
Iowa.....	14,607	1,408,137	8,947	910,002
Kansas.....	182,678	26,388,251	110,516	16,214,798
Louisiana.....	43,660	4,710,080	24,789	2,771,859
Michigan.....	40,828	4,720,371	21,971	2,570,574
Minnesota.....	154,224	18,903,068	92,353	11,388,012
Mississippi.....	46,178	4,617,547	25,482	2,785,560
Missouri.....	67,135	6,863,283	35,089	3,677,904
Montana.....	235,921	51,941,172	151,888	31,873,892
Nebraska.....	203,444	42,106,715	121,071	24,778,173
Nevada.....	8,576	1,979,818	4,173	667,694
New Mexico.....	170,039	40,288,417	84,891	18,125,118
North Dakota.....	183,421	27,274,464	134,062	19,896,006
Ohio.....	179	12,462	112	7,967
Oklahoma.....	190,439	27,976,480	111,347	16,589,467
Oregon.....	122,353	20,576,649	65,537	10,839,138
South Dakota.....	146,459	23,753,731	100,068	16,108,066
Utah.....	40,016	9,310,441	16,488	3,330,534
Washington.....	118,143	15,586,017	64,806	9,398,752
Wisconsin.....	59,503	5,240,009	31,610	3,350,945
Wyoming.....	119,256	34,128,247	64,658	16,800,958
General Land Office.....	1,947	140,520	1,716	149,493
Alaska Territory.....	1,855	269,402	1,209	129,510
Total.....	3,024,937	507,007,158	1,750,039	285,605,954

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I received this morning permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD. At this time I ask unanimous consent to include in my extension of remarks certain tabulations concerning the increase in the importations of tapioca in this country and the effect that those importations have on various industries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ALEXANDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I obtained unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD. I find the remarks will take two and a half pages of the RECORD. I renew my unanimous-consent request at this time, notwithstanding the fact these remarks will take two and a half pages of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a special order heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received by me and the reply thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

THE WAGNER ACT DOES NOT PROTECT THE WORKER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, every one in the House who has given the matter any thought probably realizes that the question of amending the Wagner Act will be brought up during this session of the Congress. It is not my purpose to speak today at length on the law or any proposed amendments but to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that from time to time I shall put into the RECORD communications received from employees tending to show the criticism of the law as it exists and of the actions of the National Labor Relations Board as that Board has been functioning since 1935 when the law went into effect.

That the C. I. O., or at least some of those who assume to speak for it or to act in its behalf have assumed for some time that the Board was its ally in the C. I. O.'s warfare on other labor organizations and in its attempt to force employees into its organization is made evident by news items contained in the press of yesterday.

It appears from the Detroit papers that a complaint has been filed with the N. L. R. B. at Detroit, charging Homer Martin, president of the U. A. W. A., with unfair labor practices. The internal fights, jurisdictional, legal, and physical, which have taken place between those who are seeking to be acknowledged as representatives of the automobile workers reached a climax when the charges were filed against Martin.

It will be recalled that, not so long ago, Martin expelled four of the high officials of his organization, charging them with Communism and with seeking to disrupt the organization. Those expelled answered his charge with one of like nature and Martin finally was compelled by the C. I. O. to reinstate the officers he had removed. Still more recently, the battle was renewed.

The expelled but reinstated officers and some of their friends now charge Martin, who was attempting to unionize Ford workers, with aiding the Ford authorities in the establishment of a company controlled or dominated union.

The situation has become so chaotic that General Motors has been forced to refuse to bargain with either faction until it is definitely decided who actually represents the employees.

Here we have a concrete illustration of how the man who works, the employee, is being deprived of his right to

bargain collectively through representatives of his own choosing.

The stake, of course, is the huge fund that will be derived from the dues collected from the thousands of workers in the automobile industry.

Recently Martin charged those opposed to him with the responsibility for more than 1,000 wildcat strikes called in the General Motors plants since the bargaining contract was signed in February of 1937.

Martin's opponents charge him with excessive spending of union funds, as much as \$2,200 a month. He replied by saying that he spent as much as \$2,800 in some months but that it was for legitimate expenses. In return, he pointed to Addes, one of the officers formerly expelled but reinstated, and charged that his expense account was \$3,500 on one occasion. He further said that one of the vice presidents admitted under oath that he had spent \$198 for whisky in 1 day and that he had also spent \$800 that he could not account for.

Martin also charged that funds of the Plymouth local had been used to aid the Communist Party and that "\$2,495 went down in the stewards' jeans."

Speaking for the opposition, Thomas, a former confidant of Martin, alleged that Martin was a dictator, had suspended 15 of the officers of the organization; that in 1 week he spent \$45 for taxicabs and \$80 for meals and concluded:

All I can figure out is that he must have been eating his meals in the cabs to spend that much.

Out of the whole sorry mess it is evident that the workingman, his interests, his rights, are being forgotten in the struggle.

The whole situation is proof sufficient that the Wagner law is not serving the purpose for which it was enacted. This is but one illustration of the fact that the act as now written and administered is the cause of industrial conflict.

Prior to and upon the enactment of the Wagner law, many people assumed that its main purpose was to protect the individual worker, to secure to him the right to organize free from coercion and to give him collective bargaining.

Unfortunately, the act was so drawn as to vest almost unlimited authority in a labor board created by the act. That Board deprives the worker of the rights the act declared he should have.

It is quite true that section 7 explicitly declared:

Employees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in concerted activities, for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection.

In practice, however, employees have time and again been denied the right of self-organization, the right to form, join, or assist labor organizations of their choice and the right to bargain through representatives of their own choosing.

The Board has seen fit to assume the right, and this sometimes without public hearing and public report, to designate the bargaining agency.

Time and time again the Board has destroyed organizations of the workers and refused them recognition.

I will not at this time make any extended argument showing how the Board has deprived workers of the rights supposed to be guaranteed to them by section 7 of the act. That subject will be more fully discussed when the Wagner law comes up for amendment, a task which we might as well assume now as later.

The purpose today is to call attention to a few protests received from employees who thought that, under section 7 of the labor act, they had the right to form their own organization and to bargain with their employer. All these letters were addressed to me personally and came either from Crystal City or Festus, Mo., within the last 2 weeks. They are as follows:

[Western Union Telegram]

We protest the un-American decision of the N. L. R. B. in disregarding the wishes of the huge majority of the workers of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. works, No. 9, at Crystal City, Mo.
CRYSTAL CITY GLASS WORKERS UNION,
ALFONSE L. LAIBEN, President.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As an American citizen, I am taking this opportunity to ask you to do something about this un-American decision handed us—the workers of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., of Crystal City, Mo. The employees have formed their own union, the Crystal City Glass Workers Union. We have a huge majority, and why must we be ruled by a minority? The decision was given us by the N. L. R. B., favoring the C. I. O.

You, as our Congressman, won't you endeavor to do something for us? Try to amend the Wagner Act and the N. L. R. B. We need your help.

Yours truly,

BEN W. HOFFMAN,
Crystal City, Mo.

DEAR SIR: In regard to the un-American decision handed down by the N. L. R. B., giving the C. I. O. bargaining rights at plant No. 9 of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., at Crystal City, we of the independent union, having a large majority of membership, cannot and will not accept this communistic decision. Any support you can give us at this time will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

BARNEY W. BERKEIGLER,
Member of the C. C. G. W. U. Union, Crystal City, Mo.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I resent an act which allows a few men like the N. L. R. B. to hand down a decision that they did the past week by ordering Pittsburgh Plate Glass works, No. 9, to recognize the C. I. O., whereby the majority should rule to be free Americanism. The independent union at time of hearing had more than 1,500 members, and now has reached about 1,700 of the 2,000 employees of works No. 9, at Crystal City, Mo., and I feel that you as one of the Representatives of the House, should do all in your power to stop such injustice against the voters. Thanking you for all you have done in the past and hope that you will continue in this matter as you have, and wishing for more "justice in the future," I am,

Sincerely,

Mr. JOHN V. DEGEARE,
Employees of Works No. 9, Crystal City, Mo.

DEAR SIR: A great injustice has been done to the people of our community. The Labor Board has given us a raw deal by giving the decision to the smallest majority of C. I. O. Our independent union, C. C. G. W. O., has 1,500 employees. The Labor Board law has to be changed. We are not going to stand for that kind of law. We expect to get some action out of this.

An employee.

JOSEPH WHISTLER,
Route 2, Festus, Mo.

DEAR SIR: We, the people of this community, have got an unjust decision from the Labor Board. The Labor Board has ordered the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., No. 9, here to recognize the C. I. O. Our independent union, C. C. G. W. U., has 1,500 members out of about 1,800 employees in this factory. Our community wants the right decision handed down to us. There is no right to that kind of Labor Board law. What do we vote for? Don't we live in United States of America? Please do something about this at court.

An employee.

GEORGE WHISTLER,
909 South Second Street, Festus, Mo.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I think the decision of the N. L. R. B. was unfair to the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. and the Crystal City Glass Workers Union at works No. 9, at Crystal City, Mo., and should be revised.

Yours truly,

LESTER A. GROBE.
Mrs. LESTER GROBE.
EDWARD G. GROBE.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Protest the unfair decision of the N. L. R. B. in regard the Crystal City Independent Glass Workers Union.

Sincerely,

JOHN L. SEIFERT,
R. R. No. 1, Festus, Mo.

DEAR SIR: You well know the dirty tactics of the few C. I. O. we have here at plant No. 9 at Crystal City and yet we still are signing new members in our independent union. Even with the communistic help of the N. L. R. B., they can't get any support here. We have an 80-percent majority and still holding it.

We need your support if you can help.

J. L. HOLLADAY,
Member, C. C. G. W. U.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Please accept my protest of the unfair decision of the N. L. R. B. last Saturday in Washington, D. C., against us at Crystal City, Mo., as one of 1,600 of the independent glass workers here. Will you vote for and support the bill pre-

sented by Hon. C. ARTHUR ANDERSON, M. C., or legislation similar to curb this unfair and un-American Board in their C. I. O. patronage.

(Signed) ANDREW L. GODAT,
Crystal City, Mo.

P. S.—You saw how they would not let you make your address in this city in November 1938.

DEAR SIR: I hereby voice my protest against a law that will permit a kangaroo court of a few men like the N. L. R. B. to hand down an unjust decision as the one they gave the workers at the Pittsburgh Plate Glass works, No. 9, at Crystal City, Mo., this past week. Although the Crystal City Glass Workers Union, an independent union, has over fifteen hundred paid-up members out of about two thousand people employed in the factory. This Labor Board says the factory must bargain with the C. I. O. We are legally organized and incorporated under the laws of the State of Missouri. We are in no ways dominated by the company, although we cannot get a hearing or a vote on bargaining rights. I feel that you, as our Representative, should try to do something about a law that does not heed the wishes of a majority. I have always felt that this was a free America and majority rules. Thanking you in advance for your kind consideration you may give this. An employee and member of Crystal City Glass Workers Union.

J. F. JOKUST.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: As an employee of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., of Crystal City, Mo., I wish to express my opinion to you of the unfair decision of the N. L. R. B. of Washington, D. C., January 14. With the hope that you may in some way be able to assist us in regaining our peace that has prevailed and we have realized and enjoyed throughout the years.

Thanking you for your interest and influence in this case, I am,

Sincerely,

P. F. MAGRE.

FEBRUARY 1, 1939.

Mr. ALPHONSE L. LAIBEN,
President, Crystal City Glass Workers' Union,
Crystal City, Mo.

DEAR MR. LAIBEN: Received your wire, reading:

"We protest the un-American decision of the N. L. R. B. in disregarding the wishes of the huge majority of the workers of Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. works, No. 9, at Crystal City, Mo."

Replying, permit me to say:

If the N. L. R. B. proceeded under section 9 without a formal hearing at which your union had an opportunity to be heard and was represented, the Wagner law, even though your union represents an overwhelming majority of the workers, leaves you without remedy. You have no appeal to the court or to any other tribunal.

Under that section of the act you will note that the Board is given authority not only to designate the unit which the representatives shall represent in collective bargaining but in selecting that unit it may (section 9 (c)), either take a secret ballot of the employees or "utilize any other suitable method to ascertain such representatives."

Using this authority so unjustly conferred upon it, the Board has in other cases selected representatives which did not represent the majority of the employees in the unit.

A reading of the law will show you that it affords no protection to workers as against the Board or a rival union.

Republicans in the House will make an effort to so amend this act as to protect not only the employee but the employer, and to remove some of the causes for industrial warfare affecting interstate commerce.

There may be a possible way out of your difficulty by reorganizing your union, if the Board claims it is company dominated; making it a union of the employees, free from influence of any kind on the part of the employer and then, if the employer refuses to recognize your representatives, file charges against the employer with the Board.

There is at least one case where the employer and the Board have acted together to deprive employees of the right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing. In that particular case, the employer was evidently forced into the agreement by the Board.

If that is the situation with you, by organizing your independent union and filing charges against the employer, you may be able to force a hearing, a final order, and then appeal to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals. It is a long, tough road, made doubly so by the attitude of the Board.

Regardless of the Board's attitude, much of the trouble will remain with us until the law is amended.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE E. HOFFMAN.

SWEETPOTATOES

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEROUEN. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, it is my purpose to call your attention to the growing of sweetpotatoes. Perhaps it is strange that I call this to the attention of the House, but we find ourselves in the midst of confusion, with all sorts of regulations and controls, and we must direct our attention to the use of land for other purposes than the growing of our five major crops.

Looking over the agricultural statistics I find there are 20 States which are vitally interested in the raising and cultivation of sweetpotatoes. They are New Jersey, Indiana, Illinois, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Texas, California, and a few other States. The three major sweetpotato-growing States are Louisiana, Virginia, and New Jersey, in the order named.

At the Louisiana State University we have been doing extensive research work in an attempt to control the many diseases and insects which are peculiar to sweetpotatoes. As you know, the sweetpotato is a tuber and is apt to contract rot from roots and infections in the ground. At this time we have produced by experiment a sweetpotato that will bloom as it has never done in this country—and will produce seed, and this is something new. We believe that by further research along the lines that we have been carrying on at the university we can furnish throughout the United States seed which can be controlled. Sweetpotatoes more or less have a tendency to acquire the diseases that are in the land, and by breeding we can treat the seed so the diseases will not be transferred to the new area or to the next potato that comes along. We also have in mind controlling the sizes, and we believe that through the experiments we are carrying on in Louisiana we can produce an attractive potato instead of irregular, small, or crooked potatoes.

I believe the sweetpotato industry should be delved into more thoroughly, so we may make use of some of the lands that are lying idle, and, for instance, because we may not be permitted to raise more of one crop or another, we should substitute in one crop what we lose in another.

The sweetpotato is the most important single food and feed crop in the South. It is outranked only by the Irish potato as a vegetable crop for the entire Nation. It has often been said that had it not been for the sweetpotato on many occasions a large portion of the population would have gone hungry. The sweetpotato has also aided greatly in supplying food for armies of the Revolution as well as for later conflicts.

As a food, it is a particularly balanced one. It contains practically all of the growth vitamins; it is reasonably high in proteins; and is particularly high in carbohydrates, such as dextrins and sucrose.

The sweetpotato was originally introduced from the more tropical areas of North America, probably from the West Indies, and when brought under conditions of continental North America it rarely, if ever, produced seed, and therefore it has been reproduced asexually from the time it was originally introduced. Any improvements in this crop have resulted from vegetative mutations, therefore systematic improvement has been slow.

Realizing the great importance of the sweetpotato crop, the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station has made every effort to improve it in Louisiana, and in the past 2 years methods have been worked out for inducing the sweetpotato to bloom and set seed under Louisiana conditions. The past season we have been able to grow around 1,500 seedlings, and for the coming year we will probably have around 4,000; whereas, in reality, under an expanded breeding program, we should have at least 15,000. Due to limited equipment and manpower, our program has been hampered materially.

Our purpose in breeding the sweetpotato are threefold:

First. To improve the nutritive value, market quality, and shape. This would include breeding for high sugar and vitamin content, and for a very uniform shape. Most of our varieties are very ill-shaped and the growers are able to market only about 50 to 60 percent of the crop.

Second. To breed varieties having a higher starch content than existing varieties. The importance of starch is increasing in Southern States. We are now importing over \$9,000,000 worth of cassava starch per year, used primarily in the South in the manufacture of paper and in the textile mills, which could be made from the sweetpotato. Incidentally, this cassava starch is coming in duty-free under the name of cassava flour. To produce higher yields of starch would require varieties bred for that purpose. Good starch varieties should yield from 20 to 30 percent starch. Table varieties usually run around 16 to 18 percent starch.

Third. To breed varieties resistant to diseases, such as the soil, stem, and black rots. These diseases are taking a heavy toll at the present time. The soil rot in particular is threatening the sweetpotato-producing areas of Louisiana, while the stem and black rots are more severe in other important sweetpotato regions of the country.

Systematic and rapid progress with the above three items can only be made through sexual breeding.

To indicate the great interest in the sweetpotato improvement program, delegates from practically every Southern State and representatives from States as far north as Delaware, Indiana, Iowa, and Kansas have made special trips to the Louisiana Agricultural Experiment Station to study the work under way there. They are anxious to see the work expanded so that they might take greater advantages of the work now under way.

We have here a challenge to American enterprise, and especially to the South, where the sweetpotato could be grown in unlimited quantities and of superior quality. The maximum capacity of the Southern States for sweetpotato production is not known. Sweetpotato growing has been more than a minor farm industry.

Never before has an appropriation been requested for this important crop. It has been estimated by the growers and horticulturists interested in the improvement of the crop that the expenditures necessary to take care of the need for improvement of this crop in the various States would require an annual appropriation of only \$80,000.

In closing, I wish to urge the Representatives of the various sweetpotato-producing States to join with me in appealing to the Appropriations Committee for the needed \$80,000 which is necessary to carry on the investigations and research now under way. This sum should be included as an item in the Department of Agriculture appropriations bill.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rules may be able to conclude its hearings and file a report on the so-called Dies resolution by tomorrow, so I ask unanimous consent that the committee may have until midnight tomorrow to file that report.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman, why this rush? Why must the Committee on Rules rush its report on the Dies resolution? Why not give the Members of the House an opportunity at least to study the hearings of the Dies committee and study its report, so we can intelligently debate the question when it comes before the House.

Mr. SABATH. I may say for myself it is my aim to give each and every Member a reasonable amount of time to be heard. The Members of the Committee on Rules desire to get this matter out of the way, consequently they have asked me to make the request I have submitted. We are going to have a hearing on the resolution at 3 o'clock this afternoon and it will continue tomorrow morning, in the hope of completing the hearings and taking action on the resolution by tomorrow.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not going to object because an objection to this request will only restrict further the time of the Members waiting to be heard before the Rules Committee; but I simply wish to state for the Record that this whole proceeding is being railroaded and rushed through without any justification.

Mr. HAWKS. What is? The resolution on the Dies committee?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Correct.

Mr. HAWKS. Judging by the information I received from the gentleman's office this morning, I would not say they were railroadng anything. The gentleman sent me enough information to show me that he has analyzed the report perfectly.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes, I have; but how about the other Members? How many members of the Committee on Rules have read the hearings of the Dies committee?

Mr. HAWKS. How can the gentleman speak for the rest of the membership?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am stating facts. I say we should have adequate time to study the three volumes of the hearings and the full report of that committee.

Mr. HAWKS. The gentleman has plenty of information, judging by what he sent to my office this morning.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Certainly; that shows I have been working on it for weeks.

Mr. HAWKS. Is the gentleman intimating I have not analyzed the Dies committee report?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am not intimating. I am saying that in view of the fact there are three volumes of the hearings and a lengthy report there has not been sufficient time for the Members of the House to digest this information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend in the RECORD the remarks I made this morning.

Mr. MAPES. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I, of course, do not expect to object, may I ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules if it is his intention to bring the Dies resolution up for consideration in the House on Friday?

Mr. SABATH. That is the desire of the majority of the committee. I felt we should take a little more time, but they desire early action. Consequently we are going to meet at 3 o'clock today and meet again tomorrow in order to give all the Members who so desire an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman has secured unanimous consent to file the report on that resolution any time tomorrow. If the committee acts and the report is filed tomorrow, is it the gentleman's intention to bring the resolution up for consideration on the floor of the House on Friday?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; provided such action meets with the approval of the Speaker and time is available.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONKIEWICZ. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago I obtained unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the inaugural address of Governor Baldwin, of Connecticut. I have been informed by the Printer the address is a little too long to come within the rule and that I should get special permission for its insertion in the RECORD. I ask for that special permission at this time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, February 2, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, February 2, 1939. Business to be considered: Continuation of hearing on

H. R. 2531—transportation bill. Mr. George M. Harrison, of the President's committee of six, will be the witness.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Naval Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives on Thursday, February 2, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., for the purpose of continuing the consideration of H. R. 2880, "To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works, and for other purposes," carrying out partially the recommendations of the Hepburn report.

COMMITTEE ON WORLD WAR VETERANS' LEGISLATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation at 10:30 a. m. Thursday, February 2, 1939.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors will meet Thursday, February 2, 1939, at 10:30 a. m., to hold hearings on the reports on Cape Fear River, N. C., and Tacoma Harbor, Wash.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Public hearings will begin Thursday, February 2, 1939, at 10 a. m., on social-security legislation in the Ways and Means Committee room in the New House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will meet in the committee room in the Capitol at 10 a. m. Thursday, February 2, 1939, to consider House Joint Resolution 135—additional appropriation for New York World's Fair.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10:30 a. m. Thursday, February 2, on the bill listed below:

H. R. 2382. Negotiation instead of competitive bidding for charter of certain lines.

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing in room 219, House Office Building, Washington, D. C., at 10:30 a. m. Tuesday, February 7, 1939, on the bills listed below:

H. R. 785. Draft Convention No. 53, officers' competency (Bland); H. R. 947 (Seger), H. R. 950 (Kennedy of Maryland), H. R. 1639 (Brewster), H. R. 1641 (Bates of Massachusetts), H. R. 1799 (Maloney), H. R. 1805 (Hall), H. R. 2534 (Culkin), H. R. 2641 (Dimond), H. R. 3210 (Cannon of Florida), H. R. 3216 (Schafer of Wisconsin), H. R. 3228 (McCormack), H. J. Res. 118 (Shanley).

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

372. A letter from the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting chapter VI of the Commission's report on its study of investment trusts and investment companies, made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 70); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

373. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend Public Act No. 111, Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

374. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to provide penalties for violations of orders, rules, and regulations made, adopted, or approved by the Public Utilities Commission and by the Joint Board of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

375. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to allow the District of Columbia nine cadet appointments at the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

376. A letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to provide for insurance rates against loss by fire and lightning and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

377. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to provide for the status of warrant officers and of enlisted men of the Regular Army who serve as commissioned officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

378. A letter from the president of the Potomac Electric Power Co., transmitting a report of the Potomac Electric Power Co. for the year ended December 31, 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

379. A letter from the president of the Washington Gas Light Co., transmitting a detailed report of the business of the Washington Gas Light Co., together with a list of the stockholders, for the year ending December 31, 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

380. A letter from the chairman of the District Unemployment Compensation Board, transmitting the Third Annual Report of the District Unemployment Board for the calendar year ending December 31, 1938; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3233. A bill to repeal certain acts of Congress (pocket vetoed); without amendment (Rept. No. 16). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 534. A bill for the relief of Hallie H. Woods; without amendment (Rept. No. 17). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 590. A bill for the relief of Macey N. Bevan; without amendment (Rept. No. 18). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 854) granting an increase of pension to Esther Ann Hill Morgan; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 856) granting a pension to John R. Gamble; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 831) granting a pension to Lawrence O. Meyer; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3167) granting an increase of pension to Margrett B. Adair; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3501) granting a pension to Elizabeth Walker; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3454) granting a pension to Robert Fuller; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3475) granting a pension to Thomas J. Davis; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3463) granting a pension to Charles H. Mattingly; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3494) granting an increase of pension to Lee Street; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 3495) granting a pension to David C. Norris; Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 3576. A bill to make effective the provisions of the Officers' Competency Certificates Convention, 1936; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H. R. 3577. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CANNON of Florida:

H. R. 3578. A bill authorizing the construction and equipment of a marine hospital in or near the city of Miami in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. R. 3579. A bill to restrict the exportation of certain Douglas fir peeler logs and Port Orford cedar logs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 3580. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to permit the serving of spirits at bona fide lunch counters; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3581. A bill to provide for municipal automobile parking lots in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FLANNERY:

H. R. 3582. A bill to require informative advertising of imported articles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. R. 3583. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such land in the city of Ponchatoula, Tangipahoa Parish, La., as may be necessary for the location of a post-office building in said city, and also to construct a suitable building thereon, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 3584. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such land in the city of Amite, parish of Tangipahoa, La., as may be necessary for the location of a post-office building in said city, and also to construct a suitable building thereon, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 3585. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by condemnation or otherwise, such land in the city of Franklinton, Washington Parish, La., as may be necessary for the location of a post-office building in said city, and also to construct a suitable building thereon, and making an appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 3586. A bill to provide for tariff-equalization fees on the manufacturing of cotton, synthetic fibers, wheat, rice, tobacco, and field corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 3587 (by request). A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to exchange obsolete, unsuitable, and unserviceable machines and tools pertaining to the manufacture or repair of ordnance matériel for new machines and tools; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOREN:

H. R. 3588. A bill to protect the production and marketing of goods and materials essential to the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLARK:

H. R. 3589. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the State Highway Commission of North Carolina to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across Waccamaw River, between Old Dock and Ash, N. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 3590. A bill relating to the taxation of the compensation of public officers and employees; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHURCH:

H. R. 3591. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Coast Guard station on the shore of Illinois at or near Montrose Harbor, Cook County, Chicago; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. R. 3592. A bill for the conservation of lobsters, to regulate interstate transportation of lobsters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 3593. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to execute an easement deed to the city of Duluth for park, recreational, and other public purposes covering certain federally owned lands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 3594. A bill to amend paragraphs 31 and 33 of an act entitled "An act to amend section 7 of an act entitled 'An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes,' approved July 1, 1902, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1932; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3595. A bill to authorize and empower the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia to limit the number of public vehicles to be licensed and operated as taxicabs in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3596. A bill to amend paragraph 57 of section 8 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1913; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 3597. A bill to provide for the appointment of research assistants in the public schools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 3598. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to establish a Civilian Conservation Corps, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1937, as amended; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan:

H. R. 3599. A bill to limit working hours of Government employees; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SECCOMBE:

H. R. 3600. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products; to prevent unfair competition; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to promote the general welfare by assuring an abundant and permanent supply of such products by securing to the producers a minimum price of not less than cost of production; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THORKELSON:

H. R. 3601. A bill to provide for studies and plans for the development of irrigation or reclamation projects at the Hungry Horse site on the South Fork of the Flathead River in Montana and on the St. Regis River in Montana; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. YOUNGDAHL:

H. R. 3602. A bill to authorize the erection of a United States Veterans' Administration domiciliary unit to provide 700 beds at Fort Snelling, Minn., and to provide the necessary auxiliary structures, mechanical equipment, and out-

patient dispensary facilities, with accommodations for personnel, and to acquire the necessary vehicles, livestock, furniture, equipment, and accessories; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. ZIMMERMAN:

H. R. 3603. A bill to amend section 36 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 3604 (by request). A bill to fix the salaries of Assistant Postmasters General; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SIROVICH:

H. R. 3605. A bill to provide a permanent force to classify patents, and so forth, in the Patent Office; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. R. 3606 (by request). A bill to require reports to the Department of Labor by contractors and subcontractors on public buildings and public works concerning employment, wages, and value of materials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor.

H. J. Res. 144 (by request). Joint resolution authorizing the Bureau of Labor Statistics to collect information as to amount and value of all goods produced in State and Federal prisons; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. KELLER:

H. Res. 77. Resolution to provide for a new Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. Res. 78. Resolution requesting information of the State Department on Mexican relations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Joint Memorial No. 1 and House Joint Memorial No. 2, with reference to lands now subject to taxation in Teton County, Wyo.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts:

H. R. 3607. A bill to credit the account of Everett P. Sheridan; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3608. A bill for the relief of Minnie M. Sears; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. EATON of California:

H. R. 3609. A bill granting a pension to Pauline M. Ridgman; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 3610. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Blair; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLIE:

H. R. 3611. A bill for the relief of Nelson H. Rogers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFITH:

H. R. 3612. A bill for the relief of Pearl A. Stevens; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 3613. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Charles F. Carter, parents and guardians of Louise Marie Carter, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. R. 3614. A bill for the relief of Frank M. Croman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 3615. A bill to correct the military record of Michael Waliga; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 3616. A bill for the relief of Margie Wamsley; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 3617. A bill granting a pension to Calvin J. Pope; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 3618. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Blake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3619. A bill for the relief of widows of certain Reserve officers of the Army who died while serving with the Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan:

H. R. 3620. A bill for the relief of Samuel Slis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 3621. A bill granting an increase of pension to Emma Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3622. A bill granting a pension to Flora Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCE:

H. R. 3623. A bill for the relief of Capt. Clyde E. Steele, United States Army; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 3624. A bill for the relief of George T. Eayres; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TABER:

H. R. 3625. A bill granting a pension to Anna L. Rumsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3626. A bill granting a pension to Ida Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3627. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha E. H. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3628. A bill granting an increase of pension to Frances K. Knoblock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3629. A bill granting an increase of pension to Sarah VanTuyt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3630. A bill granting an increase of pension to Alice Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 3631. A bill granting a pension to Lydia E. Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee:

H. R. 3632. A bill granting a pension to Leonard Stanley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of Texas:

H. R. 3633. A bill to correct the military record of Huron J. Avant; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3634. A bill for the relief of Samuel H. Mills; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. THORKELOSON:

H. R. 3635. A bill for the relief of Mary Minelich; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 3636. A bill providing for the advancement on the retired list of the Army of Arthur Glenn; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 3637. A bill granting a pension to Joseph E. Williams; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. TURNER:

H. R. 3638. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. Jackson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

743. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Joint resolution of the Ohio Legislature, relating to the failure of Social Security Board to pay Ohio October 1938 quota of old-age pension funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

744. By Mr. BALL: Petitions of certain citizens of Wilimantic, Conn., favoring the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and as amended by the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

745. By Mr. BOLLES: Petition of sundry citizens of Monroe, Wis., requesting that we adhere to the general policy

of neutrality contained in the act of August 31, 1935, and in the act of May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

746. By Mr. COFFEE of Washington: Resolution of the Seattle National Farm Loan Association, T. A. Garrett, secretary-treasurer, Auburn, Wash., pointing out that the extremely dry weather of the last summer, together with an unusually low price of milk and its products, has made it impossible in many cases for farmers to meet their installments on Federal farm loans, and calling attention to the fact that many are faced with foreclosure and loss of their homes, which would result in their having to be either supported by public-relief agencies or left to starve, and therefore urgently requesting that Congress repass the act to suspend payments on the principal of farm loans until such time as the agricultural situation improves; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

747. Also, resolution of the port of Tacoma, a municipal corporation of Tacoma, Wash., pointing out that the United States has ownership of lands under navigable waters but that title to such lands is by right and by law vested in the several States; asserting that the States cannot be deprived of their rights to the ownership of such lands without just compensation; alleging that legislation denying the States such rights would cast a cloud upon title to such lands; and therefore opposing House Joint Resolution No. 24, which would seek to revest in the United States sovereign title to, or ownership of, lands under navigable waters, or any mineral deposits therein; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

748. Also, resolution of Local 1-9, International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, of Seattle, Wash., Hugh R. Bradshaw, secretary, pointing out that the Dies committee was established by Congress to investigate subversive activities but has actually suppressed and ignored abundant evidence that Fascist spies were working openly in the United States; asserting that the committee has attempted to plaster all Progressive and Democratic organizations as communistic; insisting that the accused were not afforded opportunity to appear in their defense; alleging that the committee has attacked President Roosevelt and labor leaders; therefore urging that Congress deny additional appropriation and continuance of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

749. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of the supreme board of directors, Knights of Columbus, New Haven, Conn., opposing any action of Congress which would result in a lifting of the embargo on the shipment of arms and munitions to Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

750. Also, petition of the City Council of Revere, Mass., protesting against any reduction of the Works Progress Administration and urging an appropriation of a sufficient sum of money—at least \$875,000,000—to provide for those now on the Works Progress Administration rolls; to the Committee on Appropriations.

751. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of Rev. Eugene C. Gerlach, pastor, and parishioners of St. Margaret of Cortona Church, Madisonville, Cincinnati, Ohio, requesting adherence to the general policy of neutrality contained in the acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

752. Also, petition of Rev. Warren C. Lilly, pastor, and parishioners of Bellarmine Chapel, Cincinnati, Ohio, requesting adherence to the general policy of neutrality contained in the acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

753. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of Mrs. J. H. Brooks and 80 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging that Congress shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality, and that Congress launch an investigation of those leftist groups which are sponsoring propaganda favoring the lifting of the embargo on arms to "red" Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

754. Also, petition of 89 residents of Decatur, Ind., urging the Congress, for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary

principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

755. Also, petition of 94 residents of Waterloo, Ind., petitioning Congress, for as long as we shall adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

756. Also, petition of Samuel Lewis and 45 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging the speedy enactment of the Townsend plan bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

757. Also, petition of A. H. Burns and 13 other residents of Fort Wayne, Ind., urging the Congress to maintain the Spanish embargo, and provide adequate defense of our own country but to avoid anything tending to involve us in European or Asiatic disputes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

758. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Rev. H. C. McDowell and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the acts of August 31, 1935, and May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

759. By Mr. HARTER of New York: Petition of certain users of bakers' goods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

760. By Mr. HAWKS: Petition of 21 residents of Klevenville and Cross Plains, Wis., protesting against any change in the neutrality policy of our country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

761. Also, petition of 88 members of the Holy Name Society of Watertown, Wis., protesting against any change in the neutrality policy of our country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

762. By Mr. HOOK: Petition of H. L. Deming, urging an increase in the Works Progress Administration appropriation and increases in wages in the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

763. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of C. A. Edge, of Bryan, Tex., favoring House bill No. 220, repealing the Federal retail dealers' license on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

764. By Mr. KEAN: Resolution adopted by the La Salle Society, of Newark, N. J., urging the Congress to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as set forth in the act of August 31, 1935, and amended May 1, 1937; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

765. Also, memorial of the Newark Chapter, American Red Cross, endorsing the action taken by the International Red Cross Conference in London, June 20, 1938, asking all governments to take the necessary steps to bring about agreements which will prevent the bombing from the air, to safeguard the lives of helpless women and children and aged civilians; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

766. Also, resolution adopted by the St. Patrick's Day parade committee, opposing the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

767. Also, resolution adopted by New Jersey State Council, Knights of Columbus, opposing the lifting of the Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

768. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of 375 citizens of Greater New York, concerning the present Neutrality Act and urging the retention of the same without amendment; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

769. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Los Angeles Meat and Provision Drivers Union, relating to the Patman bill (H. R. 9464); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

770. Also, resolution of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, relating to the national parks in California, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

771. Also, resolution of the Pasadena Central Labor Union, relating to the deficiency appropriation bill to maintain the Works Progress Administration, etc.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

772. Also, resolution of the Los Angeles Presbyterian Church, relating to the boycotting of German goods, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

773. Also, resolution of the Retail Clerks International Protective Association, of Riverside, Calif., relating to the Patman chain-store bill, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

774. By Mr. MAGNUSON: Petition of 7,625 residents of Seattle, Wash., asking that as long as we adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, there be retained on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

775. Also, petition of 7,456 residents of Seattle, Wash., asking the immediate revision of the neutrality policy enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, so as to lift the embargo against the present Spanish Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

776. By Mrs. NORTON: Petition of Rita V. Smith and eight other residents of Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

777. Also, petition of Louise T. Byrne and five other residents of Jersey City, N. J., requesting the Congress to oppose any move tending to amend or repeal the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

778. Also, petition of Patrick J. Malone and 16 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

779. Also, petition of Patrick Kitson and 13 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

780. Also, petition of Eleanor Loughlin and 19 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

781. Also, petition of Pete Marcasiano and 51 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

782. Also, petition of Marie A. Kelly and 23 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., requesting the Congress to oppose any move tending to amend or repeal the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

783. Also, petition of Edward J. Hoffman and 46 other parishioners of Our Lady of Sorrows Church, Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

784. Also, petition of Anne Lynch and 21 residents of Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

785. Also, petition of Joseph F. O'Leary and 21 other residents of Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

786. Also, petition of Rev. A. L. Adzima and 66 other residents of Bayonne, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

787. Also, petition of Rev. Michael Mercolino, pastor of Our Lady of Assumption Roman Catholic Church, Bayonne, N. J., and 21 parishioners, protesting against any move to lift the so-called Spanish embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

788. Also, petition of Christine F. Keller and 20 other teachers of St. Nicholas School, Jersey City, N. J., opposing any move to lift the so-called Embargo Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

789. Also, petition of Miss C. P. Regan and 142 other residents of Bayonne and Jersey City, N. J., urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

790. Also, petition of Catherine L. Sheehan and 70 other residents of New Jersey, urging the Congress of the United States to adhere to the general policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, to retain on our statute books the further and corollary principle enunciated in the act of May 1, 1937, extending the original act to include civil as well as international conflicts; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

791. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Catholic Action Group, of Nativity parish, Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring continuance of the embargo on Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

792. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Charles J. MacLean and some 15 others, residents of Barre, Vt., petitioning Congress for enactment of legislation to stop, so far as possible, by Federal law, the great advertising campaign for the sale of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

793. Also, petition of Mrs. Waldo Heinrichs, urging modification of the Neutrality Act, leaving the Government free to decide what action to take in each given situation, providing only certain guiding principles laid down by Congress shall be adhered to; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

794. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the New Jersey State Council, Knights of Columbus, opposing the lifting of the embargo on Spain; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

795. By Mr. THORKE: Petition of the Legislature of the State of Montana, requesting legislation prohibiting the importation of foreign-manufactured flags of the United States and other national insignia; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

796. By Mr. WHITE of Idaho: Petition of certain citizens of Mullan, Wallace, Gem, and Osburn, Idaho, urging the passage of the General Welfare Act to relieve the suffering

of our needy citizens over 60 years of age and provide prosperity for America and security for all at 60; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

797. Also, petition of certain citizens of Nezperce, Idaho, urging that the United States Government put into effect a policy of nonparticipation in aggression by stopping the shipment to aggressor nations all goods that can be used by their military forces, and that immediate steps be taken to stop shipment to Japan, and that measures be taken to aid China in its desperate resistance against the invaders; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

798. Also, petition of Mullan Miners Union, Local No. 9, Mullan, Idaho, protesting against the present system of hospital operation in the United States and favoring the establishment of Government-owned and controlled hospital facilities for civilian use; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

799. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Benson W. Hough Post, No. 3424, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, approving and commending most heartily the past action of the Dies committee, investigating un-American activities, and requesting the Seventy-sixth Congress to support the above-named committee 100 percent, thereby appropriating the necessary funds to carry on this most important and urgent work; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

800. Also, petition of Rev. N. R. Athey and 46 others, urging the Government of the United States to put into effect a policy of nonparticipation in aggression, by stopping the shipment to aggressor nations of all goods that can be used by their military forces, and that immediate steps be taken to stop their shipment to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

801. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Council of the City of Binghamton, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to an airport; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

802. Also, petition of the United Church Brotherhood of Long Beach, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Chinese and Japanese conflict; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

803. Also, petition of Emilia Principa Roig, Juncos, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to neutrality; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

804. Also, petition of certain citizens of the State of California, urging consideration of their petitions with reference to the General Welfare Act (H. R. 2 and S. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

805. Also, petition of the International Union, United Automobile Workers of America, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the La Follette investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, February 1, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, February 1, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the calendar will be called for the consideration of unobjected-to bills.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.